

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6378. A bill to provide for the refund of certain interest paid by veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):

H. R. 6379. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6380. A bill to increase the amount of articles acquired abroad by residents of the United States which may be brought into the country free of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 6381. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 6382. A bill to provide a coordinated anti-inflation program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUFFETT:

H. J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. J. Res. 390. Joint resolution to authorize the erection of a marker to commemorate the poem *The Blue and the Gray* and the event which inspired its composition; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6383. A bill for the relief of Jacob Reder and Erna Marcelina Frenkel Reder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROPHY:

H. R. 6384. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Katchios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6385. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy M. Evans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1846. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of E. F. Freytag and 33 other residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, in support of legislation to reduce postage on packages mailed to European countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1847. By Mr. PATMAN: Petition of Mrs. George P. Grout and 45 other members of the Bogata, Tex., Methodist Church, protesting against the inclusion of tobacco and American wine as a part of the aid to the peoples of Europe under the European recovery program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1848. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Max Kloen, Roslyn Heights, Long Island, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the grant of the reissue of United States Letters Patent No. 1,815,303; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1849. Also, petition of Miss Rosa Lee Smith, Jacksonville, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1850. Also, petition of the chairman, Citizens Protective League, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to permitting the entry of German nationals into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

XCIV—317

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 29, 1948

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Spirit of God, Thou who givest liberally to all men, whisper into our souls the secret of obedience to Thy holy will. We pray Thee to give us that repose of mind which believes that all things work together for good to them that love the Lord. We thank Thee that we can live by deeds and thoughts, rather than by years marked on the dial of time. No matter if the veiling fog shuts out the stars, we praise Thee that above all abide the immortal words sounding in the recesses of the soul: Peace, be still; it is I, be not afraid. In the Master's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 182. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document the factual analysis on housing entitled "Housing in America" for the use of the Joint Committee on Housing.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 48. Concurrent resolution authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1949; and

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and include extraneous matter.

FOOD PRICES

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a Member of this body made an appeal for the return to controls because food prices have gone up. Nothing new was learned. We all know that food prices have gone up, but they have not gone up simply because there are no controls. I wish to quote from an article by George Thiem, staff farm writer of the

Chicago Daily News. He says, and I quote:

There is no mystery about high food prices.

The United States has been pumping food and resources to foreign countries at a rate never equaled in the history of the world.

People are putting 17 percent more food per capita under their belts than in the pre-war period.

And until lately consumers spent their money for food because there wasn't much else in the stores to buy.

University of Wisconsin economists came up with these explanations after digging into the causes of current price levels.

The experts put the finger on grain prices as the culprit in the whole upward spiral.

EXPORTS BIG FACTOR

Heavy wheat and corn exports built a fire under the grain market, causing repeated explosions at the Chicago Board of Trade.

Higher grain raised flour and bread prices. The cost of a ham, pork loin, and standing rib roast went up because high-priced corn was used to make them.

Singling out United States exports in 1946, the Wisconsin men said: "The export level was twice as high as the 1920 peak after World War I. It was five times as heavy as in 1938 and nearly 10 times as great as in the depression of 1933. These exports are largely Government promoted."

HIGHER PRICES, HIGHER PAY

Continuing the analysis: "Food prices bring demands for higher wages. Higher wages increase the price of most manufactured goods and the price of all services."

Unlike other war periods, this time agricultural products rose faster than nonfarm goods and reached higher peaks. Nonagricultural prices have not reached the peaks of other wars.

But the heyday of the farm boom is past, the economists conclude. The farmer's net in 1948 will be less than that of last year. His prices are falling, but his costs will stay up.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TWYMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. We want to put controls on our exports. That will keep prices down here if we do it right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two instances and in one to include an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from today's Tribune.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two separate instances.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record in two separate instances.

Mr. SNYDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include extraneous matter.

GREAT BRITAIN AND PALESTINE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I had intended to confine my modest efforts this week to housing, but events will not permit that.

Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the world this week will be focused on Great Britain. Will Great Britain take counsel of statesmanship or will Great Britain take counsel of the chagrin and resentment of her Bevins and cause the Arab legion of the Kingdom of Transjordan, trained, led, financed, and organized by Great Britain, to administer the final "stab in the back" to the Jews in Palestine and to the United Nations? The whole world this week will watch to see the result.

I believe—and I think I have a right to believe—that the people of Great Britain, like the people of the United States, feel that the United Nations is mankind's last best hope for peace. The United Nations needs to be supported, not undermined, in the Palestine situation. Great Britain can show that she means what she says about supporting and strengthening the United Nations now.

Heretofore it has been much too easy to slough over Britain's derelictions in not cooperating with respect to Palestine with the United Nations Palestine Commission. We have been asked to overlook her callous supply of arms to the Arab states, openly backing the Arab invaders in Palestine, due to claimed "treaty arrangements," while our arms embargo was applied vigorously to the Jewish defense forces. We have been asked to overlook allegations of damaging restrictions and discriminations by British forces respecting these Jewish forces. But now the issue is clear. In not staying the hands of the organized Arab armies, which we now see to mean the Arab legion of Transjordan, led, financed, organized, and directed by Great Britain, in a plan to invade Palestine, she will show her real intentions. I sincerely hope that even at this late date Great Britain will be true to her tradition of justice and will cooperate with the United Nations.

The world this week will see what it shall see.

I append hereto an editorial on this subject from today's Washington Post:

ABDULLAH'S POSITION

Whether Emir Abdullah, of Transjordan, is or is not moving into Palestine, there is little doubt in our minds that he holds the key to Jew-Arab understanding, and that the British hold the key to Emir Abdullah.

Hitherto, however, the great powers since last November have been engaged in pushing the Emir into the arms of the Arab League. This league has been widely touted by some of our diplomats as well as our military, as a formidable combination capable of proclaiming and leading a jihad, or holy war. The plain fact is that it is a loose body, in great part of British creation, composed of hardly reconcilable elements. Abdullah cannot forget that King Ibn-Saud of Saudi Arabia robbed his family of their rightful kingdom, their native Hejaz. He likewise is

at dagger's drawn with the man who is running the Arab Higher Committee in Palestine, namely, the Mufti. Both of them are doing everything in their power, by intrigue and otherwise, to bring about Abdullah's downfall. The notion that he would open his kingdom to forces belonging to his enemies is too fantastic to be entertained. Yet Transjordan, which is the main territory abutting upon Palestine, would have to be used in any large-scale invasion.

It is clear in the nature of things that Abdullah must be scared that his own kingdom might invite partition by his enemies if he goes into all-out collision with the Palestine Jews. His dilemma is extreme. Strong action by the United Nations might have spared him from it, but, looked at from Transjordan, and, indeed, from the whole of the Middle East, the United Nations must now seem even more pallid than the Arab League. And the United States, which he doesn't know but from which he longs for recognition, cannot give him any confidence as to its reliability. The fact is as apparent here as it is there that America has been dazzled by bogeys created by romantic Arabophiles, some of them members of our Foreign Service, who showed their loyalty by kicking through the American goal as soon as the Assembly and the United States had backed the Sundstrom report in favor of partition.

Abdullah, however, does know the British. His kingdom is the only one in the Middle East that is tied body and soul to the British. The only one of the rulers who does not subsist on oil royalties, he is kept going by a direct subsidy from the British, and the British, moreover, run his army, second-best in the Middle East to the Jewish Haganah. That army is the Arab Legion, 25,000 strong. At present part of it is being borrowed by the British administration in Palestine as police. The Jewish Agency charges that the forces are being used to allow positions, as, for instance, the airport at Lydda, to fall into Palestine Arab hands. Be this as it may, the Arab Legion without the British and Abdullah himself without the British would be in a parlous condition.

Whether the British can now use their influence over Abdullah in behalf of peace with justice is problematical. That they have lost touch with realities and are taking counsel of their fears was indicated in the collapse of what an authoritative English news letter calls their treaty mania with the Arabs. The incredible Foreign Secretary Bevin actually refused to tell a critical House of Commons yesterday whether the British would continue to finance, arm, and officer Abdullah's legion in the event of invasion of Palestine. Abdullah must feel in a cleft stick as a result of the imbroglio about Palestine. All that has happened since last November has, indeed, put a premium on intransigence in the Middle East, both among the Arabs and among the Jews. Good will alone will never produce results in Arab lands subject to Pasha control. Force is needed to back good will, resolve as well as paper must clothe resolutions. Mr. Churchill made this plain during the 1937 debate on the Peel scheme of partition. In an advertisement in the Washington Post yesterday the Committee for Justice and Peace in the Holy Land asks Americans to support the plans of their Government, because partition has been shown to be unworkable. Nothing in the Holy Land has yet been shown to be unworkable except irresolution.

THE GEOMETRY OF OLEO

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during yesterday's debate on the oleomargarine bill certain thoughts occurred to me which I was about to put into the Record when debate on the Case substitute to the Hill amendment was closed by the action of the House. I should like, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to make these observations now, for I think they are still pertinent.

I have observed, Mr. Speaker, when I have accompanied Mrs. Jenkins on her shopping trips, in the manner of most husbands, that oleomargarine is generally sold in square packages. The Hill amendment would have required that it be sold in triangular packages. Now, as I recall my geometry, according to the famous Pythagorean theorem, the square on the hypotenuse of a right-angle triangle is equivalent to the sum of the squares on the other two legs. There is, therefore, as one can easily see, a very definite relationship between squares and triangles. There is, however, so far as my recollection goes, which, with the passage of the years, might, however, well be faulty, no such definite relationship between squares and triangles, on the one hand, and circles, which formed the substance of the Case substitute, on the other hand. I was, therefore, opposed to the Case substitute as not germane to the subject and voted against it.

With respect to the Hill amendment, while the relationship of which I spoke exists, I could see no good reason for substituting the constituent triangles for the square of which they were but a component part. It is a complete work of supererogation. Consequently, I was opposed to the Hill amendment.

My final observation is that I wonder what Euclid and Archimedes would have thought of yesterday's debate. I am inclined to think that they would be greatly surprised to observe the lengths to which their studies have progressed. But then, of course, "progress"—and I place that word in quotation marks—is the hallmark of this modern age and is what distinguishes us from the arrogant, opinionated, and unlearned beasts.

TAXES IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, we people of New York are proud of our State. We are particularly proud that it has been a leader throughout the decades in the enactment of progressive laws and in the administration thereof in a manner which has brought good government. Our nonpolitical school system is a model for the country. Our courts, manned by well-paid judges, enjoy undisputed pres-

tige. Our civil service, based on measured merit, is free of political interference. Our workmen's compensation laws pioneered similar laws elsewhere and grant maximum protection to our people.

In no branch of State government, as a matter of fact, is the State of New York deficient.

Such fine government costs money. The people of the State of New York

have been willing to tax themselves heavily to supply the revenue which our brand of government requires. I append herewith a tabulation of these taxes and rates:

Type of revenue	Measure of tax	Rate of tax ¹
Personal income tax.....	Net income; nonresidents, net income derived in State.....	2 to 7 percent. Net capital gains, 1 to 3½ percent. Exemptions: Single person, \$1,000; married, \$2,500. Each dependent, \$400. Tax reduced 25 percent for income of calendar years 1941 to 1944; 50 percent reduction for income of calendar years 1945, 1946 to 1947.
Business taxes:		
Corporation tax (art. 9):		
Sec. 181. Foreign corporations.....	Capital stock employed in State during first year of business and any increase thereafter.	½ of 1 percent of par value, or if no designated value, 6 cents per share. Minimum tax, \$10.
Sec. 182. Real estate.....	Gross assets employed or situated in State during preceding year and dividends as apportioned.	¼ of 1 mill on \$1 of assets. Minimum tax, \$10. 2 percent on dividends as additional tax.
Sec. 183. Transportation and transmission.....	Capital stock within State during preceding year.....	Dependent on dividends but not less than 1 mill on \$1. Minimum tax, \$10.
Sec. 184. Transportation and transmission, additional.....	Gross earnings in State.....	¼ of 1 percent.
Sec. 185. Agricultural cooperatives.....	Capital stock within State during preceding year.....	Dependent on dividends but not less than 1 mill on \$1. Minimum tax, \$10.
Sec. 186. Water, gas, electric, steam, lighting and power.....	Gross earnings in State. Also dividends in excess of 4 percent on paid-up capital in State.	¼ of 1 percent of gross earnings and 3 percent of dividends in excess of 4 percent. Minimum tax, \$25.
Sec. 187. Insurance premiums.....	Gross direct premiums less return premiums thereon on risks located or resident in State.	1 to 2 percent but non-United States fire and marine, ½ of 1 percent.
Utilities tax (gross receipts).....	Gross income or gross operating income (as defined) as the case.	2 percent.
Corporation franchise tax (art. 9a).....	Entire net income or other applicable measure.....	4½ percent. Minimum tax not less than (1) \$25, (2) 1 mill on \$1 of capital or (3) 4½ percent of 30 percent of income plus certain salaries.
Organization of corporations.....	Authorized capital stock.....	½ of 1 percent of par value, or if no designated value, 5 cents per share. Minimum tax, \$10.
Unincorporated business tax.....	Net income within State.....	3 percent.
Bank tax.....	Net income for calendar year.....	4½ percent. Minimum tax \$10 but not less than 1 mill on \$1 of apportioned issued capital stock.
Insurance premium tax.....	Net income.....	4½ percent.
	Gross direct premiums, less return premiums thereon on risks located or resident in State.	1 to 2 percent depending on type of insurance and on place of incorporation.
	Underwriting profit on business in State.....	5 percent.
Excises on consumption:		
Motor-vehicle tax.....	Weight, seating and carrying capacity.....	Passenger: 50 cents per hundredweight and 75 cents per hundredweight over 3,500 pounds. Commercial: Light delivery cars, \$12; trucks, 80 cents per hundredweight. All other: Various.
	Flat rate.....	3-year chauffeur, \$5; operator, \$2; renewals: Chauffeur, \$4; operator, \$1.50. 1 year chauffeur, \$3; operator, \$1; renewals: chauffeur, \$2; operator, 50 cents.
Motor-fuel tax.....	Sale of motor fuel within State.....	4 cents per gallon.
Alcoholic-beverage tax.....	Sales of beer, wine, and liquor within State.....	Per gallon: Cider, 1½ cents; beer, 3½ cents; still wine, 10 cents; carbonated wine, 20 cents; sparkling wine, 40 cents; liquor with not more than 24 percent alcohol, 50 cents; liquor, \$1.50. Varying schedule, \$1 to \$7,500.
Alcoholic beverage control licenses.....	Nature of business and size of locality.....	1 cent for each 10 cigarettes or fraction thereof.
Taxes on transfers and exchanges:		
Cigarette tax.....	Sale of cigarettes within State.....	1 to 20 percent.
Inheritance and estate tax.....	Residents, net estate; nonresidents, so much of net estate as consists of real and tangible personal property in State.	Sales, 1 to 4 cents per share. Other transfers, 2 cents.
Stock transfer tax.....	Shares of stock.....	In first zone, 6 percent of total pari-mutuel pool plus 60 percent of breaks, as defined. In second zone, 5 percent and 50 percent. Harness races, 5 percent and 50 percent.
Pari-mutuels tax.....	Pari-mutuel betting pool.....	
Other taxes:		
Racing tax.....	Price of admission tickets sold or disposed of.....	15 percent.
Motion picture tax.....	Length of film.....	\$3 per 1,000 feet or fraction thereof for original film, \$2 for copies.
Boxing exhibitions tax.....	Total gross receipts.....	5 percent.

¹Excluded from this chart are the collections earmarked for the war bonus account as, follows:

	1947-48, estimated	1948-49, estimated	Rate
Personal income tax.....	\$2,500,000	\$31,000,000	10 percent of normal tax.
Cigarette tax.....	2,500,000	16,750,000	Additional ½ cent for each 10 cigarettes or fraction thereof.

In addition to taxing ourselves as per the above, the people of the State of New York, in 1947, paid 19.8 of all the Federal Government's internal revenue collections.

In view of such participation in the cost of the Federal Government, and in view of the extent to which we tax ourselves for our State government, is it not fair for the people of the State of New York to say to the people of other States, "Tax yourselves as extensively as we tax ourselves, and at corresponding rates, before you come to the Federal Government for Federal aid that will add to the tax burden we already carry"?

ONE VERSUS THE MANY AND OLEO VERSUS THE PEOPLE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear about the progress of the great State of New York. But as far as I am concerned, it was rather surprising to me yesterday to see so many people put down in black and white that they felt they had more information than their State legislatures, their assemblymen, senators and governors, all the people of their State. It is difficult to believe New York can make these forward steps with the approval of Washington. Being a modest soul, I hope I never get myself in the position of

knowing more than the Governor, the State legislature, and all the people of my State. I would not want the people of my district or my State to think that I knew more than they did. This super-duper attitude is a foreign approach and not the American way. As long as they have State laws on oleo or any other legislation, I would want to give them the consideration they deserve and not give the impression that I knew more than all the people of my State and its representatives know.

This is a hang-over from the New Deal. All the knowledge emanates from Washington, as though the people were not capable of thinking for themselves. They must be imbued with the feeling that States' rights deserve little recognition and that Washington has all the answers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

AN ENGLISHMAN'S OPINION OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House will be interested in knowing that the Liberal Party in England recently adopted a resolution deploring the "measures taken by the Government for the compulsory direction of labor and the continuation in peacetime of conscripted military service."

At the same time Guy Naylor, chairman of the Association of Liberal Trade-Unionists, said:

We are at this moment living on the charity of Americans. Everyone diverted from production has to be supported by the United States.

This English labor leader explained that this being so, American taxpayers were in reality paying the way of every man in an English uniform, conscript or volunteer. He even went so far as to call British soldiers American mercenaries.

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more and more evident every day that many distinguished Englishmen realize that the so-called Marshall plan is merely underwriting their socialism. As Mr. Churchill recently said:

All this money which comes to us has to be earned by a mass of ordinary people in America who voluntarily deny themselves many things.

Mr. Churchill told his countrymen:

We should be proud once again when we are earning our own living and paying our own way.

Americans, no less than Englishmen, can be proud once again when they pay their own way and are no longer dependent on socialistic subsidies from funds which should be used to increase productive capacity of America and the entire world. Let us hope the advice of these distinguished Englishmen will be heeded and that there will be a world-wide movement for men once again to stand on their own feet. Only then can we have a peaceful prosperity.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette April 27, 1948.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Indianapolis News.

PRESIDENTIAL APPOINTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the press I learn that Candidate Stassen and some of the Washington papers' editorials find fault because Senator TAFT intimated that the Republican Senate would not confirm Mr. Lillenthal and perhaps some other appointments of the President. Now, I would like to ask Mr. Stassen and the Washington press, too, for that matter, and all others of like mind, what is the use of having two parties, a two-party system, and then have a party which expects to win the next election, as the Republican Party does—and the Democrats, I think, concede that—what is the purpose in confirming all of those appointments and letting the New Dealers continue in power during the next 4 years? The purpose of an election is to afford the people an opportunity to change the makers and administrators of law. For a party which expects to direct the Government during the next 4 years to freeze into office the opposition is just the height of a silly, absurd policy that does not even make good sense politically. Now, when the Democrats won—and they were in power for 15 or 16 years—they gave the offices to members of their political faith. And that is all right with me. I go along with that old Democrat, Jackson, I think it was, who said, "to the victor belongs the spoils." There is no use in trying to improve conditions unless we kick all of these boys out down there; not a bit. I am wondering whether Mr. Stassen intends to retain all the New Deal bureaucrats who have misdirected us so long.

INFLATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised at the remarks made by my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

One fellow said the other day that "the New Deal Democrats and ERP Republicans are going to wreck this country yet."

But, I want to refer to the address made a few minutes ago about inflation. If you want to do so, you can curb this inflation, but so far nothing has been done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, is the gentleman looking at me?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am just looking over the gentleman's head.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is fine.

Mr. RANKIN. With my mind's eye, I was looking at candidates Taft and Stassen and Dewey and the chairmen of the Committee on Banking and Currency of both the House and the Senate and wondering why they neglect this vital issue.

Prices in a free economy are controlled by two things: The volume of the Nation's currency and the velocity of its circulation. The circulating medium has been spiraling from less than \$5,000,000,000 in the early thirties to \$28,110,000,000 on January 31. Unless the Congress of the United States takes back the power given it by the Constitution to "coin money and regulate the value thereof" and takes away from these private banks, these Federal Reserve banks, the right to inflate our currency, they are likely to wreck this country. I have pointed this out time and time again. It is the most serious problem that now confronts the American people.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Who passed all these laws? The New Deal Democrats. They are responsible for it, and we are going to clean them out.

Mr. RANKIN. You are in charge now, and you have not done a thing about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; we did. We took the tax off oleo yesterday.

Mr. RANKIN. That is as near as you have come yet to solving the question of curbing inflation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

INFLATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the gentleman's explanation of inflation. He probably is correct. I have a simple one. Inflation is nothing more than more money than goods, and the cure is to have more goods than money. It is simple, but it rings true.

Now, in connection with inflation, yesterday I received a phone call from a farmer in western Nebraska saying that they were short of oil and gasoline, to carry on their farming operations. That condition is going to get worse in this country, and one reason for it is that we are shipping out of this country tremendous amounts of oil under the so-called ERP. You just cannot ship it out of the country and have it here at the same time. You folks from New England who were crying that you were cold last winter may be colder this winter, because the amount of oil shipped out of this country is far in excess of what the country can stand, and consequently the

supply is insufficient to meet our own needs.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The shipping of this material abroad is going to cause a further inflation of the currency. Now, mark that. Inflation is going to increase, and those prices to the American consumers are going to increase.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Coming back to my definition of inflation. It is more money than goods, and the cure is to have more goods than money. Factories are running at capacity. There is full employment in this country. When our citizens try to buy the goods they need and find that under ERP these goods have been shipped out of the country, it all means inflation and a dislocation of our own economy.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 40, 42, 50, and 54.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, and 68, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"TEMPORARY CONGRESSIONAL AVIATION POLICY BOARD

"For an additional amount for salaries and expenses for completion of the work of the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board created by the Act to establish a National Aviation Council, and for other purposes (Public Law 287, Eightieth Congress), to be available until June 30, 1948, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the Chairman, \$5,000: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be made in accordance with the laws applicable to inquiries and investigations ordered by the Senate."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

"Such sums as may be necessary (not exceeding \$4,500,000) are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this paragraph shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949: *Provided further*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 in accordance with such Vocational Rehabilitation Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$970,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$262,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 22, 30, and 34.

STYLES BRIDGES,
CHAN GURNEY,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KEER,
GEORGE H. MAHON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS

Amendments Nos. 1 to 7, inclusive, relate to miscellaneous items for the Senate and involve additional appropriations of \$47,550, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 appropriates \$12,500 for the widow of a deceased Representative, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates \$5,000 for the Temporary Congressional Aviation Policy Board, as proposed by the Senate, with an amendment added to provide for the completion of the work of the Board concurrent with the expiration date of this appropriation, June 30, 1948.

Amendment No. 10 waives a limitation for the Public Health Service in connection with the purchase of motor vehicles in the Philippine Islands, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11 authorizes the advance to States from the 1949 appropriation of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, as proposed by the Senate, but limits the amount that may be advanced to the sum of \$4,500,000.

Amendment No. 12 strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$1,850,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation administration.

Amendment No. 13 appropriates \$970,000 for reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen instead of \$840,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14, relating to the Public Buildings Administration, appropriates \$50,000 for preparation of plans to eliminate structural and fire hazards in the Executive Mansion, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 15, relating to the Office of the Housing Expediter, appropriates \$2,000,000 to carry out the functions of Public Law 464, approved March 30, 1948, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16, relating to the National Mediation Board, appropriates \$48,800, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17, relating to the National Railroad Adjustment Board, increases a limitation from \$65,000 to \$75,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18, relating to the Tax Court of the United States, increases a salary limitation from \$20,000 to \$24,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19, relating to the District of Columbia, appropriates \$10,210 for the Office of Administrator of Rent Control, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20, relating to the District of Columbia, appropriates \$17,500 for the National Guard, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 21, relating to the Department of Commerce, appropriates \$20,000 for printing and binding instead of \$39,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 23, relating to the Department of Commerce, transfers \$262,500 to the Bureau of Customs for enforcement of the export-control program instead of \$225,000 as proposed by the House and \$300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 corrects language.

Amendment No. 25 provides for the transfer of \$15,000 to "Printing and binding" of the Department of Commerce as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 26, relating to the Department of Commerce, allows \$10,000 to be used for emergency medical services in Alaska, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, appropriates \$665,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$625,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 28, relating to the Bonneville Power Administration, increases a limitation by \$140,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 29 increases a limitation in the Bureau of Land Management of the

Interior Department from \$310,000 to \$325,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 31 inserts language providing for general funds, construction, in the Bureau of Reclamation, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, appropriates \$3,000,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33, relating to the Bureau of Reclamation, appropriates \$1,000,000 for the Central Valley project instead of \$1,274,281, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34 reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 35, relating to the Bureau of Mines, appropriates \$4,000,000 to liquidate contract authorizations, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36, relating to the National Park Service, inserts language to provide for fighting forest fires in Acadia National Park, Maine, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37, relating to the Department of Justice, increases limitation on fees of witnesses from \$25,000 to \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 38 and 39, relating to the United States Employment Service, appropriates \$40,800 for general administration, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40 strikes out the proposal of the Senate to appropriate \$2,560,000 for additional grants to States for public employment offices.

Amendment No. 41, relating to the Department of the Army, provides for the transfer of \$143,000,000 for government and relief in occupied areas from the appropriation "Pay of the Army, 1948," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation of a similar amount as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 42, relating to the Department of the Navy, appropriates \$3,800 for the Naval Home, as proposed by the House, instead of \$9,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43, relating to the Post Office Department, "Compensation to postmasters," provides for the transfer of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates \$665,000 for "Star-route service," as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$765,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 45, relating to the Post Office Department, "Star-route and air-mail service, Alaska," provides for a transfer of \$224,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 46, relating to the Post Office Department, "Star-route and air-mail service, Alaska, 1946," provides for a transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 47, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates \$300,000 for unpaid money orders more than 1 year old, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$321,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48, relating to the Post Office Department, appropriates \$89,000 for transportation of equipment and supplies, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$305,200 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 49, relating to the Post Office Department, provides for the transfer of \$100,000 for "Operating supplies, public buildings," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 50 strikes out the proposal of the Senate relating to the Department of State, international obligations and activities, for administration of the program au-

thorized by section 32 (b) (2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

Amendment No. 51, relating to the Department of State, international obligations and activities, provides that \$1,600,000 shall be available without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$2,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52, relating to the same subject as amendment No. 51, provides that the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army shall handle certain construction work abroad for the Department of State.

Amendment No. 53, relating to the Department of State, allows not to exceed \$100,000 for certain moving expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$570,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54, relating to the Department of State, provides that \$60,000 shall be available for activities authorized by titles II, III, and IV of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as proposed by the House, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 55, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, provides \$300,000 for refunds, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 56, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Accounts, provides for \$1,000,000 for "Payment of certified claims" to be derived by transfer as proposed by the Senate instead of direct appropriation of \$700,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 57, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of the Public Debt, provides for the transfer of \$381,000 for "Distinctive paper for United States currency" as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 60, relating to the Treasury Department, Bureau of Customs, provide for refunds in the amount of \$4,500,000 and for the use of certain collections for reimbursements, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 61 and 62, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, provide an increase in the limitation on printing and binding in the amount of \$140,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 63, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, appropriates \$568,000,000 for "Refunding internal revenue collections," as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 64, relating to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, provides for the transfer of \$1,250,000 for "Salaries and expenses," as proposed by the Senate, instead of a direct appropriation of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 65, relating to the Secret Service Division, provides for the transfer of \$10,700 to reimburse the District of Columbia as proposed by the Senate instead of a direct appropriation of the same amount as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, JUDGMENTS, AND AUDITED CLAIMS

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67 provide for the payment of claims, etc., as set forth in Senate Document No. 132, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE III—REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS

Amendment No. 68, relating to the Department of the Army, reduces the rescission for "Pay of the Army" to \$32,300,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$175,300,000 as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The managers on the part of the House have authorized the following motions with respect to amendments in disagreement:

Amendment No. 22, relating to voluntary agreements and export controls under the Department of Commerce, that the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "\$225,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein".

Amendment No. 30, relating to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, provides that not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for loans to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes in connection with the emergency work program, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 34, relating to the Department of the Interior, Boulder Canyon project, provides for the payment of \$39,000 from the Colorado River Dam fund to the Boulder City School District, as proposed by the Senate. The managers on the part of the House move to recede and concur.

JOHN TABER,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
KARL STEFAN,
FRANCIS CASE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN H. KEER,
GEORGE H. MAHON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 22: On page 15, line 17, strike out "\$750,000 of which" and insert the following: "\$375,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 22 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "\$225,000: *Provided*, That the authorization granted the Secretary of Commerce in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, with respect to utilization of funds for export controls and for allocation and inventory controls or voluntary agreements relating thereto, is extended from March 31 to June 30, 1948: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available herein."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 19, line 21, insert the following: "of which amount not to exceed \$100,000 shall be available for loans to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes, members or association of members thereof for the purchase of milk animals."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34, on page 22, line 9, insert "Boulder Canyon Project: For payment to the Boulder City School District in accordance with the provisions of S. 1985, \$39,000, payable from the Colorado River Dam fund."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1949

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 559 and ask for its immediate consideration. The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and now yield to myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives points of order against H. R. 6355, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. Of course, it is understood by Members of the House that ordinary appropriation bills do not require a rule. The rule was requested in this instance because in the appropriation bill there is a provision consolidating in the Federal Security Agency the employment services which are presently in the Labor Department and the Unemployment Compensation Service, which is now in the Federal Security Agency. That being a legislative provision, it was necessary for the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to request this rule. This provision in the appropriation bill, if adopted by the Congress, will save approximately \$21,000,000 a year. You will recall that just recently, under the Presidential Reorganization Act for 1948, the Chief Executive proposed the consolidation of both these agencies in the Labor Department. The Congress rejected that reorganization plan.

In the Federal Security Agency there is an organization, the Bureau of Employment Security, which has been administering the unemployment compensation. If these services are consolidated, as this appropriation bill pro-

poses, you not only save this sum of money but you get more efficiency.

These services have all been consolidated by the States at the State level, with the exception of the State of Idaho, and they are now in the process of consolidating these services in that State. So it is an economic saving to have them consolidated in the same way at the Federal level.

I feel that the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the members of his subcommittee should be commended for doing what I think is a splendid job in reducing the Budget estimates of the Federal Security Administration. I had the pleasure and the honor, at his invitation, to appear before his committee and testify concerning certain activities that my Committee on Publicity and Propaganda has reported to the Congress. I am convinced, as a result of the investigation which we made, that the Federal Security Administrator, particularly the Bureau of Research and Statistics, have unlawfully diverted Federal funds for publicity and propaganda activities. It is most gratifying, therefore, that the committee has reduced the Budget estimate for that Bureau from \$229,830 to a round figure of \$100,000.

They have made an over-all saving in the Social Security Board of \$1,377,000.

If the work of my committee exposing the propaganda and publicity activities of this agency has resulted in the Appropriations Committee cutting off \$129,830 from this one bureau, then I think my committee has rendered a great service not only to the country but to the Congress, and especially to this Appropriations Committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Where is that cut of \$129,830?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. According to the report, I understand that the Budget estimate for the Bureau of Research and Statistics was \$220,830. The Committee reduced that figure to \$100,000.

As I have already mentioned, one of the best things in this bill is this legislative provision which makes this rule necessary, by consolidating these two agencies, the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service, in the Federal Security Agency.

I hope the Congress will overwhelmingly support the committee in this action.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of confidence in the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I believe that his intentions are honorable and that he actually aims to effect a saving to the Government. Whether it does or not I do not know.

A rule was granted upon this bill the same day that it was reported by the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Rules did not have before it a printed numbered copy of the bill, just the committee print, and voted for the rule without a quorum being present.

The points of order that are waived against the provisions of the bill apply to legislative provisions of the bill pertaining to the transfer of the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency, and to section 109 of the bill which prohibits the payments of salaries to employees who are members of an organization whose officers have not complied with the requirements of the Labor-Management Relations Act—Taft-Hartley Act—and those committed to striking against the Government. Both these provisions incorporated in the appropriation bill are clearly in violation of the rules of the House in that the Committee on Appropriations is improperly invading the legislative field.

This arrogation will come to plague the House, giving, as it does, the right to the Committee on Appropriations to legislate. Not that I hold any brief for Communists or sanction the employment of any persons who strike against the Government or advocate its overthrow, but I object to the usurpation of the powers of a legislative committee by a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and the full committee.

I have served notice that I will oppose such methods in legislating in appropriation bills and all I can do now is to call attention to the inclusion of legislative matter in an appropriation bill before us. You have a majority, you have the power and, yes, you are flaunting that power and you do as you please. In acting in this manner, I wish to assure you that if I had been present when the Rules Committee gave this rule, it would not have been done without a quorum being present. I serve notice now that no rules will be granted by the Committee on Rules, especially on appropriation bills carrying legislative provisions, without a quorum being present, except where there is a unanimous report from a legislative committee.

What I am opposed to is this—and I think the House should know—the Appropriations Committee again arrogates legislative jurisdiction of this House. I am sorry that we have not the report of some of the gentlemen who made the investigation of this matter.

I did not know, really, that this matter would come up this morning. Furthermore, I have been under the weather more or less, and there are so many things that I have not been able really properly to familiarize myself with, particularly the real purpose that lies behind this effort.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a question? I agree with the gentleman that he has been ill and has been overworked, and I think on these matters the gentleman owes it to himself to take a rest here at Bethesda or one of these sanatoria. I think the gentleman is overworking all the time.

Mr. SABATH. I think I will be obliged to do so. I am here against the orders of my physician, but I feel that I owe the duty to the House and the country to be here and call attention from time to time to unfair legislation and unfair action taken that is manifestly unwarranted, and deprives the legislative committees

of their prerogatives under the rules of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, I know; if the gentleman is not able—

Mr. SABATH. I am trying to do as well as I can, as the gentleman will see. As I say, unfortunately I do not have all the facts before me, but I am going to rely on the members of the committee who possess, in my opinion, greater knowledge of the matter than I do; and I always try to safeguard and protect the rights and privileges of legislative committees, and I feel that I should call attention to what this resolution seeks to do. I will read it; it is short; it will take only half a minute. It says:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Under that resolution, as I have stated, all points of order are waived. The Appropriations Committee can bring in almost anything without having any jurisdiction in the matter, according to this procedure. That is what I complain against. My efforts during a long tenure in the House have been to safeguard and protect the membership of this House so they would not be deprived of their rights, and at the same time protect and safeguard the rights of the committees who have the duty of reporting legislation after thorough and careful consideration. I do not know how much time has been given to this matter of merging the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service in the Federal Security Agency; but I do know it is contrary to the provisions of the President's reorganization plan and will reduce the Department of Labor in usefulness.

Personally, I suspect that this merger is not for the best interest of the country. It may save money; yes; and I am for saving every dollar that we can. It is the duty of the Members of the House, it is the duty of the Congress, to save every dollar possible and practice economy, but, notwithstanding all of the assurances and promises of economy that you gentlemen have made since you became a majority in the House, instead of saving money you have expended larger sums than necessary and much larger sums than were ever expended by the Democrats when they were in control of the House.

I know that the gentleman from Rhode Island will make it clear that the Appropriations Committee is again assuming a jurisdiction it does not possess under the rules of the House. I repeat, I do not think the Appropriations Committee should deprive the regularly constituted legislative committees of their rights and duty. Later I hope to have a little time, while the bill is being considered, to point out the underlying unfairness of this matter and the reasons why this merger is to be made. I do not think the object is to save the \$139,000. In fact, I do not think there will be any saving. I have very often heard you gentlemen of the majority pledge yourselves to save money, but, unfortunately, every week you bring

in additional bills for unnecessary appropriations. How you will be able to justify your statement that you are going to save money, so far as the taxpayers are concerned, I do not know. Of course, you are very skillful, you are even very astute, and you know how to try to mislead the American people, but I am of the opinion that the American people now realize that they were misled in 1946, and I hope they will not be misled again in 1948.

The American people know that under the New Deal the country prospered. Everyone was a beneficiary of its wise and far-reaching efforts. The Nation never before was so prosperous, and the people know this was unmistakably due to New Deal legislation.

Mr. Speaker, saving money is very proper if you do it without injuriously affecting the departments that are actually doing an honest work or trying to do so and if it promotes efficiency in the Government.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I have given I am obliged to oppose the adoption of this very unfair rule. However, I repeat, I realize that you of the majority have the votes and you will pass it notwithstanding its unfairness, the same as has been done heretofore. I regret, however, that you fail to recognize the needs and the rights of the people and the membership of the legislative committees.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the people and press of this country were humiliated and indignant upon learning of the condition of the Navajo and Hopi Indians. I am today introducing a resolution creating a select committee, to be appointed by the Speaker, to conduct a thorough investigation of the condition of all of the Indians of the United States and Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, the terrible distress existing among some of our Indian tribes was forcefully brought to the attention of the present Congress by H. R. 4627, which I introduced. This bill was a temporary measure to bring stop-gap relief to the Navajo and Hopi Indians. Hearings were held on the reservation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands. The committee subsequently unanimously reported the bill to the House. It was passed and became law. An appropriation was then authorized to take care of the most urgent needs during the past winter and for coming months.

In the treaty of 1868 with the Navajo Indians the United States Government set aside 16,500,000 acres of land, much of which is the very poorest land in the West. There were less than 9,000 Navajo Indians when this treaty was signed. At that time they could eke out a meager existence by hunting wild game and raising cattle and sheep. Now, however, their population has increased to over 60,000 and is increasing at the rate of 1,200 yearly. The overcrowding on their barren land has reduced their average family income to less than \$400 a

year. The infant mortality rate has continually increased until it is now 318 per 1,000, or seven times greater than for the entire United States. There are no field doctors or nurses, only one school nurse and one full-time dentist attending these sixty-odd-thousand Americans.

The same tragic story can be told concerning education. With some 24,000 children of school age, only 8,000 have had any schooling whatever, and their average is less than 3 years. This means that 16,000 Indian children, wards of the United States Government, receive no school facilities, no educational opportunities to help them help themselves. Only 12 percent of the Navajo Indians included in the selective-service records of 1943 could speak English.

What is true with respect to the Navajo and Hopi Indians, is probably true with reference to other American Indians on other reservations. This tragic condition cannot continue. Its seriousness requires immediate action. The whole problem of American Indians must be thoroughly investigated. It is a humanitarian task of the first order of importance, and it must be promptly solved. It must be solved by planning a long-range program that will make the Indians in both continental United States and Alaska economically self-sufficient, that will give them an education qualifying them to meet the needs of the times, and the understanding of health and hygiene that will eliminate the extremely high mortality rate of both infants and young children.

The present disgraceful conditions cannot be permitted to continue. It is not only a blot upon the entire Government, but it is a costly perpetuation of a tragic situation. Some \$59,000,000 has been asked for appropriation during the coming year to administer the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Educate these Indians, give them an opportunity to break away from the tribal conditions of a century ago and make their way in the world, and they will make as fine a class of American citizens as any we now have. They are humans, even as you and I, and they must be treated as humans.

I have also introduced House Resolution 564, which appropriates a meager \$50,000 to make this investigation, report, and recommendation to Congress. The Committee on Public Lands has already saved far more than twice this amount in money it could have expended under the provisions of the Congressional Reorganization Act. This small sum, used wisely, can bring effective savings to the American people of millions of dollars and can make self-supporting citizens of our Indian population.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, since I have been a Member of this body, for the last 8 years, I have always opposed legislation on an appropriation bill. I could never see the need of a subcommittee on appropriations going to the Committee on Rules and getting a rule to bring up a bill to appropriate money. In this bill we have taken away from

the legislative committee of this House, which has to do with the consolidation of the USES and Unemployment Compensation, that responsibility and have taken upon ourselves as a committee on appropriations the right to legislate in this body. To me that is not right. It is not easy to legislate, and I do not think there is any need for an appropriation committee to have to resort to the Committee on Rules to get that protection to bring up this bill after holding all the hearings that we have held.

The main point of contention in this rule is that we have taken it upon ourselves to transfer out of the Labor Department the Employment Services which were inaugurated in the Labor Department in 1918 during the First World War and continued in the Labor Department until 1939. Because of the passage of the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933, it then became a definite function in the Labor Department. I have never heard any criticism in this body or throughout the country as to how the Labor Department has handled the Employment Services. During the last war they were placed in the Federal Security Administration, they were placed under the War Manpower Commission, and they were finally put back into the Department of Labor, where I sincerely believe they belong. The President early this year sent his first reorganization plan to this body. It was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] is also a member of that committee.

This reorganization plan was to the effect that it would consolidate the USES and the Unemployment Compensation Commission into the Department of Labor. It would leave the USES in the Labor Department as it is now and take the UC out of the Federal Security Administration and transfer that agency into the Department of Labor, where I have always believed the two belong. But what happened to that reorganization plan? This committee came on the floor only about 6 or 8 weeks ago and turned down the reorganization plan of the President to consolidate these two agencies. The reason they used in general debate on this floor when they turned it down was that last year this Congress appropriated \$750,000 to establish the so-called Hoover Commission to reorganize the executive branch of this Government. So this committee said at that time, only 6 or 8 weeks ago, "What is the rush? Why should the President ask that these two agencies be consolidated in the Labor Department? We have already a Commission that we are spending \$750,000 on that is to report to the next Congress, in January of 1949. Why should we do anything in this body to effect such a reorganization when this Commission is working toward that end and will report to the Congress in January of 1949?"

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. The gentleman knows, of course, that the transfer of the Unemployment Service to the Labor Department was done by Executive order under the War Powers Act, and when that act expires it will automatically go back to the Federal Security Administration.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Why is it not an advantage to send it over there now and save this \$21,000,000-plus every year?

Mr. FOGARTY. The same argument that I used can be used just as well in answer to the gentleman from Indiana.

On February 25 on this floor the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd], a member of this committee, said in regard to the President's reorganization plan:

We have already appropriated \$750,000 for the Hoover Commission to make an over-all study of the executive branch. It will include, of course, this particular question—

The same question that is before the House at this time.

Inasmuch as the committee is divided and the House is divided, it seems to us on the committee that the sensible procedure is to wait until next January, at which time we will have before us the findings of the Commission composed of very able and distinguished students of government. No harm will be done in the next 10 months by failure to transfer these two agencies now to the Department of Labor.

If that statement was good in February of this year, it should be good now, and it applies to this very same question.

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], said on that same day on the floor of this House:

It seems a little absurd to suggest at this time that we should have piecemeal reorganization plans for the executive department.

It seems no more than the use of common sense to suggest that we wait and get the results of this expenditure of what may be from \$750,000 to \$1,750,000 by a nonpartisan, fully qualified commission made up of men who have had experience along the lines of reorganization.

So he opposed the reorganization plan on that day.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER] also a member of that committee, said on the same day:

The reason I think we should pass the resolution before the committee is because last year this Congress provided for the appointment of a Commission and provided funds for the use of that Commission in making a comprehensive and complete study of the organization of the executive branches of the Government.

It seems to me that it is wisdom to delay our action until we have a report from this Commission.

That was the argument used to defeat the reorganization plan of the President to take the Unemployment Compensation Commission out of the Social Security Administration and move it over and consolidate it with the USES in the Department of Labor. So what do we do on this committee? After a legislative committee of the Congress had gone into this thoroughly and after it had been turned down following due consideration—and it was turned down in this

body and sent over to the Senate—the very same arguments used in this body were used in the other body to defeat the reorganization plan of the President in consolidating these two agencies. Almost the very same language was used there as was used here to defeat this program. So we come along now and we are saying in effect that even though this legislative committee had studied the reorganization plan, what they did and what they said did not mean anything back in February of this year. We believe that we know more about the reorganization of the Government than they do. Here we are as a Committee on Appropriations attempting to reorganize the executive arms of the Federal Government. It is a field we have no business in. It is the work and duty of a legislative committee. It has nothing to do with us as an Appropriation Committee. Although I know there is no chance of this rule being voted down—I know it will pass—I am opposed to it on the ground that it is definitely legislation on an appropriation bill.

Then toward the end of the bill we add another item. I read from the report:

For a number of years the appropriations bills have each carried a provision denying the use of funds to pay salaries or wages of any employee who engages in a strike against the Government, who advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence, or is a member of an organization that advocates the right to strike against the Government or the overthrow of the Government by force or violence. The committee has amended this provision to include a prohibition against the payment of salaries or wages to any employee who is a member of a labor organization the officers of which have not filed the affidavit required by subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act as amended by the Taft-Hartley Act. That section denies the services of the National Labor Relations Board to any labor organization whose officers have failed to file an affidavit stating "that he is not a member of the Communist Party or affiliated with such party, and that he does not believe in, and is not a member of or supports any organization that believes in or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods."

The sum and substance of that provision in this appropriation bill is, of course, aimed at one labor organization in our Government, the UPWA, which I agree with my chairman is headed by an out-and-out Communist. I agree with my chairman, as I think the vast majority of this body does, that we do not want any Communists holding Government jobs in this country. I think we all agree to that, but I do not like this way of legislating. It is another method of legislating under a limitation on an appropriation bill.

There were no hearings held on this provision. It was never discussed in the hearings that we held on this bill. It came to us when we marked up the bill that morning. It was something I never heard of before. It came out of a clear sky. No one has had an opportunity to appear before the committee to state his views either for or against such a provision in this bill. I just do not think that is a good way to legislate. If we

are going to throw things like that into appropriation bills, without giving the people who are interested on one side or the other an opportunity of going there and expressing their views, I think it is about time something should be done about it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has again expired.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. I have no further requests for time right now.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule and shall vote against its adoption.

Again we have an instance where the Appropriations Committee of this House is spending its time not to look into the money figures in an appropriations bill, but to legislate. In this bill carrying appropriations for the Federal Security Agency which will be considered immediately after the decision upon this resolution, the Committee has spent its time on the legislation and reorganization of these bureaus rather than upon the amount of money that might properly be saved to the taxpayers. As part of the Republican mad rush of senseless economy since the Eightieth Congress convened in January 1947 there has been a reduction from the budget estimates on this bill of 1 1/4 percent. The total bill amounts to almost a billion dollars. Again the vaunted predictions of the Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations and other gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have come to nothing, because we find that the President's budget estimate in this instance have been so nearly correct and proper that they have been able to reduce the bill only to the extent of 1 1/4 percent of the amount of funds requested in the budget estimates. It would have saved everyone's time if they had given blanket approval to those budget estimates, and we would now have a better bill.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time now on the rule only in order that the record may be kept straight at this point in the RECORD.

With respect to the remarks just made by my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], he has expressed some glee over the fact that the committee has not been able to effect more substantial savings than we have made. The fact of the matter is, which he ought to tell this Congress and tell the people of the Nation, that in the bill which is pending before us, if you will look at the report you will see it carries a total of \$797,000,000 in mandatory grants to the States for the payment of old-age and survivors' insurance and similar items, over which this committee has no control whatsoever. So when the gentleman uses his little figure of 1 1/4 percent, he applies the saving to the entire grant program. He knows and everybody knows that has a grain of sense—and I know he has many grains of sense—the argument is preposterous and

absurd, and utterly and completely misleading.

The facts are that on that portion of the bill on which we had an opportunity to make reductions in the public interest we had exposed to us appropriation items amounting to \$170,000,000, and we have lopped off from those requested appropriations \$20,623,000, a far cry from one-and-a-fraction percent reduction. So far as I am concerned, I am not interested in just wielding a broadax in an attempt to strike out reductions of appropriations and I insist that it be done with some degree of intelligence, but I think it is only fair that the facts be presented to the American people and that Members of Congress should not stand up here, rub their hands, and gleefully claim that the Republican Party has not reduced the budget by more than one-and-a-fraction percent.

I ask the gentleman from New York or any other gentleman on the Democratic side: Do you expect us to wipe out the old-age and survivors insurance grants?

Do you expect us to wipe out the grants under the Social Security Act that are administered by the Children's Bureau and the Bureau of Public Assistance?

Of course you do not; and neither do we. Then why are you standing here and criticizing the Congress because it is compelled under mandatory law to make these appropriations to the tune of \$797,000,000?

Just one further thing about this rule: My good friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has spent a lot of time on that phase of the situation. I will not take the time on this rule to explain to you the necessity on this side, but I want you to know, Mr. Speaker, that if I ever was in earnest and ever presented to this Congress a proposal which was based upon logic, common sense, and decency, and the result of a tremendous expenditure of hard work and time, you have it before you in this bill today.

Let me tell you something: This Subcommittee on Appropriations could not possibly have brought you a bill, in my humble opinion, due to the reorganization in the Federal Security Agency that was contemplated by the Administrator himself and bring about a complete integration of the program which they themselves want unless we brought into the Federal Security Agency this employment agency now resting in the Labor Department. That agency is going to go into the Security Agency under existing law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. All we are doing is accelerating the time and we are compelled to do it in order to meet the intricacies that are involved in the total reorganization program that has been taking place in the Federal Security Agency and which has the full and complete approval both of the head of the Social Security Administration, Mr. Altmeyer, and the

head of the Employment Service, Mr. Goodwin. When I asked the specific question: Should these two services be put together and consolidated? the answer was "Yes." Where should they be consolidated? In the Federal Security Agency.

They say we are legislating. It is true we are, but I want to say to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island that this committee has not legislated blindly in this matter and in usurpation of the rights of the legislative committee. I will say to him that the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was fully advised and consulted with respect to this proposal, as was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the author of the proposed reorganization resolution under which the Hoover committee is operating. They were called into conference on this when the whole thing was suggested, and the suggested consolidation meets with their complete approval.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did the gentleman say that Mr. Goodwin made the statement that he thought the USES should be consolidated and put into the Federal Security Administration?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. I made exactly that statement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is it in the record?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know whether the gentleman attended the hearings or not, but I asked the question and he gave that categorical answer. I asked the same question, as the gentleman will remember, of Mr. Altmeyer and after a good deal of fumbling around I forced him to make a categorical answer.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding that there is no quorum present I shall not make the point of order that a quorum is not present, nor shall I ask for a roll call on this rule because it would merely take up time.

Mr. HARNES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to state that he appoints as Speaker pro tempore for the balance of the week the Honorable CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 2287, the RFC Extension Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee of the Whole and include extraneous matter.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1949

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for not to exceed 2 hours, 1 hour to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and 1 hour by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, one of my colleagues objects to limiting it to 2 hours. He suggests 3 hours, with the proviso that if we can get through sooner than that we do so.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the experience in connection with this bill in the past has been that we have not even consumed the 2 hours. It seems to me that is a very liberal amount, in view of the fact that one of the principal arguments that might be made has already been made by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island in the consideration of the rule. I have no desire to limit debate, but I feel 2 hours is a very liberal amount of time, in view of the limited character of the proposals in this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. I would be inclined to agree with the gentleman, but, having been in the hospital during most of the time the hearings went on during the past couple of months, I have to rely on the judgment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who feels that 2 hours is too short a time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a request for 20 minutes I may inform the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has requested 20 minutes?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; so that 1 hour on each side would not be enough.

Mr. KEEFE. I have frequently requested 20 minutes time to speak on a proposal and have been given 3 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman make it 2½ hours?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to that and will modify the unanimous-consent request to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House

on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6355, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is entitled "The Supplemental Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1949." Now, ordinarily the amounts carried in this bill would have been a part of the regular supply bill for the Federal Security Agency and the Labor Department, which we passed some weeks ago, and which has recently been passed by the Senate. The reason that this comes in as a supplemental supply bill is because certain unavoidable circumstances existed at the time we reported the other bill. You will recall that at the time the other bill was under consideration by the subcommittee, the President's reorganization plan was pending before the Congress. The budget estimates that came up from the President were made in contemplation of the fact that the Employment Services would remain in the Labor Department, and that there might be transferred to the Labor Department out of the Federal Agency the Bureau of Employment Security, which presently is a part of the Social Security Administration.

Because we could not tell what would happen to that reorganization plan, we decided that the part of wisdom required us to await action by the Congress in determining whether or not they would effect the consolidation of these two services of the Labor Department or leave them separate as they are. So, we withdrew that appropriation entirely from the first bill. Then next, when the Federal Security Agency officials came before the committee to testify in support of the budget recommendations for the various elements of the Federal Security Agency, we found that Mr. Ewing, now Federal Security Administrator, was putting into effect very vast and wide reorganization programs within the Agency itself which made the budget estimates which had been prepared many months in advance completely outmoded and completely out of date and without any specific reference to the Federal Security Agency as it would be if the reorganization within the Agency was completed according to the plans of the Administrator. So, we decided that we would take out of the first bill all of the appropriation estimates for the Federal Security Administrator's office and the Social Security Administration and leave that for further consideration until the reorganization within the Agency was completed.

In addition to that, we had a program submitted to implement the National Mental Health Act, and when the testimony was presented before the committee it was apparent that a very inadequate showing was made in justification of the budgeted recommendation. Now, the committee was interested in seeing to it that a program was set up in implementation of the National Mental Health Act that would be a very effective program, so we took that appropriation out

of the other bill and delayed it for further consideration until we could have full and complete hearings on the program that was to be initiated under the Mental Health Act.

The same is true of the dental health program. We have had long and extensive hearings on both the mental health and the dental health programs since that time.

So we bring this bill here containing these appropriations estimates.

In addition, during the hearings there was brought to the attention of the committee by Governor Gruening, of Alaska, and by the public-health officer of the Territory and by the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] a very, very important story and a very devastating and pathetic story, may I say, as to public health in Alaska. They were down here in an effort to get budget approval immediately for very critically needed services in the Territory of Alaska. The committee, responsive to the needs of the people of this country at all times, decided that we would not wait to go through the normal processes of having the Bureau of the Budget pass upon this question, and we had a long hearing before the subcommittee, which completely convinced us that it was absolutely necessary that we take immediate steps to provide funds for the United States Public Health Service in order that they might initiate a public-health program in Alaska to supplement the public-health services conducted by the Territory itself. So you will find that we have set up a fund here of about \$750,000, which is very much less than the amount they asked for, but we permitted expenditure of that fund upon an 8-month basis so that they could immediately go to work and set up a program of public health in Alaska. In the meantime, when the next Congress reconvenes, we can inspect the program that they have set up and determine how much further we want to implement that program in Alaska.

The committee was unanimous upon this program on both sides. The committee was unanimous upon the public health program. I want to say to my colleagues and say to the country at large that I think the Congress is doing one of the greatest things that has ever been done in the promotion of public health in this country when we implement the efforts that are being made to attack this devastating problem of the increase in mental illness that is taking place in this country. The evidence that was brought before the committee by the distinguished men of the profession throughout the country clearly indicates that we have fallen behind in this country in dealing with this problem of mental illness and mental frustrations that are so directly responsible for the crime and so directly responsible for the juvenile delinquency that is costing us such an appalling sum here in this country, to say nothing of the maintenance of the domiciliary care of the 655,000 mental patients that are compelled to stay in public-supported mental institutions, and to say nothing of the 62 percent of the medical cases of the Veterans' Administration that are in the psychotic class and need

psychiatric care and treatment. It is an appalling situation, and we propose to do something about it. We propose to encourage throughout this country the teaching of psychiatry and the training of psychiatric personnel and clinicians so that we may be able to service the institutions of the country that are so deficient, because they simply do not have the trained personnel.

Think of it, out of the total number of about 137,000 trained physicians in this country only 3 percent have any training whatsoever basically in the field of psychiatry. Right today there are 3,000 beds in veterans hospitals that ought to be occupied by psychotic cases which they cannot fill because they do not have any doctors or nurses or technicians to treat them.

I have been advised that their programs call for the building of facilities for 15,000 more beds. Why provide these beds and hospital facilities unless we are able to provide the personnel to adequately service them? This proposed mental-health program is one of distinguished character, in my opinion, which is going to make a monumental contribution in a number of respects. We are going to give aid and help to medical institutions in this country in teaching in the field of mental health. We are going to grant fellowships to students and practitioners of medicine who will go into the field of psychiatry. The reason they have not been attracted heretofore has been that under the grant programs you say to a young man, "Won't you please specialize in the field of mental illness?" and he says, "Yes; I have that disposition to do that." So they grant him a fellowship for 1 year, and he does not know from one year's end to the next whether Congress will continue the appropriation to enable him to complete his course. That has been one of the contributing factors in tearing down the personnel and one of the blocks in this road that we must travel if we are to provide the necessary personnel to equip our country to deal with the menace of mental illness.

This committee has done something unusual and yet which has been asked for for years and years and years. While we have provided large funds to implement the National Mental Health Act in the form of grants, community facilities, and other facilities as well as education, we have done something more than that—we have provided for forward financing under contract obligation that will permit the Public Health Service in the administration of these funds to say to one of these young men or women who sees fit to go into the field of psychiatry and mental health, "We will assure you that if you go into this, you will be taken care of and that this grant or scholarship will continue through the years so that you will be enabled to complete your course." We have provided that under a contract authorization which will become effective next year. Thus, under the advice of the best people in the United States, we hope that ultimately we may attract to the field of mental health and psychiatry trained personnel who are so absolutely necessary if we are going to fight this ever-growing

menace to the mental health and security of our country. Along with that goes the great program of research which will be carried on in research institutions in this country to be coordinated at this great hospital that you have provided at Bethesda, a major portion of which, if not all, will be devoted to cancer, heart disease, and mental health.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be a Member of a Congress that has had the foresight and vision and which has, with almost complete unanimity of purpose, approached this program of public health with the determination that we are going to wipe out the disease that has devastated humanity by finding the causes of it in the best way that we can.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the members of the professions who have given their full and complete support to this program and hundreds of whom are willing to take refresher courses and training in order that they may be available to deal with this menace of mental illness.

We make provision in this bill for the extension of the dental-health program in order to give to the people of America, and especially to the children of America, the benefits that are to be derived from the topical application of sodium fluoride to the teeth.

We did not establish as extended a program as had been contemplated by Dr. Knutson when he first appeared, but we have reorganized and reoriented the program along the lines that have the complete support of the dental societies of America and the complete support of the State medical organizations in the several States.

We are providing funds in this bill for about 50 mobile units to be organized by the Dental Health Section of the Public Health Service, that will go into every State in this Union, and out into the rural areas; and under the direction of the State Public Health Services and the grass roots dental organizations, the Parent Teachers Associations, and so on, bring to them the techniques that may ultimately result when this program goes forward, the prevention of at least 60 percent of the tooth decay in children.

I am for the program. I think it is a great step forward. I look forward to the time when through research and the efforts to put this thing into the hands of the people of America, tooth decay in children may become a thing of the past.

Now, I have discussed these three aspects of the bill, mental health, dental health, and aid for the people of Alaska in setting up a health program there.

Do you know that in Alaska, which is a strategic and critical part of our military defense, I was shocked and amazed at the report of a committee of five doctors of the American Medical Association that went to Alaska to make a survey and study, to find for example that in Alaska, our people, our country, under our domain and our direction—people are dying at the rate of 343 per 100,000 from tuberculosis, while the average in America is only 43 per 100,000. When you get the figures on venereal disease and the incidence of syphilis in Alaska as given to us by the territorial health officer and the gentlemen who made a very thor-

ough survey, it is simply devastating in character. We propose to do something about that. They are our people, and if we are going to send our boys, our soldiers into Alaska to serve the country, we want the health conditions in Alaska such that they will not be exposed to the terrible situation that exists there today. I know the Congress will support us unanimously in our efforts in that regard.

I told you something about the Federal Security Agency and the proposed consolidation that is involved with the United States Employment Service. Let me discuss that a little more fully. I do not have time. If I took the entire hour there would not be enough time to adequately discuss that program. The members of my committee and myself have spent untold weeks on this proposition. Personally I have never worked so hard and so long on anything in my life as I have to try to bring this thing about. Now what is the situation? The Federal Employment Services in this country, under Federal-State relationship, were established under the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933. The Wagner-Peyser Act is the only law on the statute books that gives justification and authority for the establishment of the federally supported employment service. It does not provide for complete and full support, because it provides for a State-Federal system, in which there are matching funds to be put up by the States and the Federal Government. That was in 1933. In 1936 you passed the Social Security Act and you set up a program of unemployment compensation. You allowed the collection of a tax of 3 percent to provide funds to implement the unemployment compensation and you provided that three-tenths of 1 percent of the funds collected from industry, should be set aside to provide for the administration of the funds and carry on the administration in the States of this unemployment compensation. That fund has grown to tremendous proportions, something over \$800,000,000 in excess of the amount of money needed to pay the administration expenses of unemployment compensation, which have been derived out of that three-tenths of 1 percent tax. What happened? The old Social Security Board said in order to administer the provisions of the unemployment compensation law we have to have some agency that will provide job exposure to the person who comes into the office of the Unemployment Compensation Commission asking for unemployment compensation. So they by regulation of the Social Security Board designated the Employment Service in the country as the agency that would make the job exposure, and thus they brought together the Unemployment Compensation Agency and the Employment Agency working hand in hand, one offering people payment of unemployment compensation based upon the applicant's subjecting himself to a job exposure to be provided by the Employment Service.

What happened? In 1939 the reorganization plan of that date transferred the Employment Service over to the Federal Security Agency from the Labor Department, and after the federalization of

the Employment Service when Mr. Roosevelt got the governors of the various States to turn those services over to the Federal Government and they federalized the employment service, they were transferred to and became part of the War Manpower Commission which was headed by Mr. McNutt, the War Manpower Commissioner, who was also Federal Security Administrator and by that Executive Order 9117 dated December 17, 1941, acting under the temporary authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, the President transferred the employment service over to the Labor Department, and under the provisions of that Executive Order the USES will go back to the Federal Security Agency from which it came just as soon as there is a finding that the war is over. The President by his executive order sought to transfer the Bureau of Employment Security which in effect is the unemployment compensation arm of the Federal Security Agency, and put it over in the Labor Department. Congress rejected that by an overwhelming vote.

When the committee came to the consideration of this problem we found Bob Goodwin's organization, the USES, down here in the Labor Department, the Bureau of Employment Security controlling unemployment compensation over in the Federal Security Agency, and out in the States where the work is done and where the money is spent, where the compensation is paid, those services have been integrated under one director and under one agency in every State of the Union except Idaho, and they will accomplish it very shortly, as the director from Idaho told me in my office day before yesterday. We have this very funny situation: Two agencies in Washington allocating Federal money, one for the administration of the employment offices in the States, the other for the administration of unemployment compensation in the States, the States being required to submit two budgets to Washington, one budget for the employment service submitted to the Labor Department, and one budget submitted to the Federal Security Agency for the Bureau of Employment Security, unemployment compensation, each with their conflicting, duplicating, and overlapping staffs, the USES with its budget-appraisal group, its State technical-services group, its economic group, and its auditing group; the Federal Security Agency in the Bureau of Employment Security with its auditing group, with its budgeting group, with its States financing-service division, and all duplicating, all overlapping services which everybody concedes ought to be brought together as the States have brought them together in order to avoid duplications and to try and save some money. So what did we do? We called these people in. There is not a soul in the world that I know of who says that these services should not be consolidated. Everybody admits that. The Congress has said: "We do not want that consolidated in the Department of Labor." The Congress has spoken very clearly on the matter. The law says they will be consolidated in the Federal Security Agency 6 months after it is found the war is over.

What do we do? We simply carry out the express will of the Congress of the United States and carry out the express will of Mr. Goodwin and everybody connected with it who says the Employment Service is being destroyed and interfered with and that the morale of the people in that department is being broken up because they do not know from day to day, from week to week or from month to month where they are going to be. So in the interest of doing a good job we did this.

I could have gone along. That would have been the easy way out. I, as chairman of the committee, could have gone along and said: "Take these budget estimates, submit the bill to the Congress," and let it go at that. But, Mr. Chairman, I have never worked that way in my life and I do not propose to work that way here. I have chosen to take the hard course. It has been a tough job to bring about this reorganization with all the technical services that are involved and to get them properly integrated.

What have we done? We have had all this testimony before the committee and you can read it in the hearings. The Bureau of Employment Security is a division of the Social Security Administration. Up here sits the Federal Security Administrator. Down here is the Social Security Administrator, and under him the Bureau of Employment Security, old-age survivors insurance, and the assistance to States—three over-all functions. The Bureau of Employment Security handles unemployment compensation.

Mr. Altmeyer wanted us to take the USES, the Employment Service, transfer it to his bureau and make the consolidation there, providing for a whole superstructure of supernumeraries below him and between him and the Federal Security Administrator.

We decided to do just one clear job that anybody can understand. When this appropriation is carried through, as I believe it will be, the Federal Security Agency will be administered by an administrator—that is Mr. Oscar Ewing. Direct line of authority will go down to the Social Security Administrator. Next to that the Chief of the Children's Bureau, next to that the Pure Food and Drug Administration, next to that the Office of Education, next to that the Public Health Service, and next to that the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. All of these bureaus will be on a straight line, each with its bureau chief directly responsible to the Federal Security Administrator and each with its subdivisions handled by division chiefs in the proper line of set-up, with direct line of authority going to the Federal Security Administrator.

What do we propose to do? We take the USES and put it over in the Federal Security Agency. We take the Bureau of Employment Security out of the Social Security Administration and we create one more bureau over there, putting these two agencies together as divisions of the Bureau of Employment Security, with one bureau chief, with a subagent or chief of the UC, as one division, and with the head of the Employment Service in the other division.

What do we accomplish by that? We wipe out all of the duplication of technical services, we wipe out all of this duplication of auditing, all of this duplication of high-salaried people engaged in budgeting and accounting, and we bring the whole thing together at one place just as has been done in the States. When we make an allocation of funds to the States then we make one allocation for both UC and the Unemployment Service. One budget comes up from the States and one budget examination here in Washington.

In doing this we have wiped out the 12 regional offices of the USES. That is what they do not like. They have these fat \$10,000 jobs out in the field and some fat \$8,000 and \$9,000 jobs out there. We have done away with 12 of those regional offices. We have done away with the separate regional offices of the Social Security Administration and we propose to establish 1 regional office, the regional office of the Federal Security Agency, with 1 regional director to whom will be delegated responsibility in the field from the Federal Security Administrator here in Washington. In that office there will be suitable representatives just exactly on the same plane as we have effected the reorganization here. There will be some people devoted to technical services in the States in the field of unemployment compensation, others in another division dealing with USES, but we will do away with all this multitudinous overhead that is involved in the present system, and if I stay here long enough and can have my way about it—and I know I am supported by the overwhelming majority of the people in the Federal Security Agency—we will have 1 Federal Security Agency Administrator, with 1 set of field offices, and we will not have a multitude of field offices for the Public Health Service, the Children's Bureau, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, or the Office of Pure Food and Drugs. They will be brought together in 1 field office where the citizens of the United States who want to do business with the Federal Security Agency can go and there be advised as to what the program is.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is more responsible than any other one man in Congress for what is being done toward promoting research in mental health, cancer, and such diseases that threatens the future of the people of America.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman for the remarks which he has made. I, of course, cannot take the time to go into all the details, and you would not expect me to do that. If you will read the report, which is a very wonderful report prepared by my distinguished clerk, Mr. Paul Wilson, with the very able assistance of Mr. George Harvey, you will find there one of the finest contributions that I think has ever been made to an appropriation bill for enlightenment and illumination as to the details of this proposal. While I am on that subject, may

I say to you, my friends, that I have served now nearly 9 years on the Committee on Appropriations and had the opportunity to serve with three great clerks. The first one, Marc Sheld, the second one, John Pugh, and the third one, George Harvey. George has done a masterful job as the chief clerk of the Committee on Appropriations, and he has done an overwhelming job in connection with the tremendous amount of work that has been necessary to orient and bring this bill before the Congress. I want to pay a personal tribute to him, and I want to say that following right along with him in the very distinguished character of a great clerk of the Committee on Appropriations is my young friend, Paul Wilson, who has done a great job. Those people know neither hours of labor nor anything else except fidelity to the job they are doing. Nights, Sundays, Saturdays, holidays, all those days mean nothing to them, and were it not for them, the Congress never would be able to get these appropriations, and especially this one, in the form in which it is.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to add my tribute for the wonderful work I know they are doing. That has been true in connection with matters I have taken up with the gentleman's committee.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, under this consolidation what will happen to the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mr. KEEFE. I was coming to that. Of course, the gentleman is always interested in matters affecting veterans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Just as the gentleman is.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. If you will read the hearings, you will see that we have conducted long sessions. It is a rather anomalous situation, the whole veterans' employment matter. It is being given consideration now by the Board which we set up under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act in 1944. I had General Gray before the committee, and General Hershey. Unfortunately the other member of that committee, Mr. Schwellenbach, has been ill. We have been trying to see if we cannot work out a program that the Congress intended should be worked out, so that we could provide a decent, workable, fine service to the veterans of this country in the matter of securing employment.

I am fearful that the thing is not working out. I am also fearful that this board that we set up to declare over-all policies in the matter of the veterans' employment service is not functioning, is not having any meetings, and is not laying down any policies, and is not taking the direct interest in the veterans' placement program that I think the board itself should take. I believe, under the stimulus the committee gave to General Gray when he was before it—and he was kind enough to sit there a whole

afternoon in connection with this matter—they are going to go to work.

We have left the appropriation at the budget estimate. The organization follows right along with the USES, this part of it. It will be transferred with the USES as an integral part of the USES, and with separate identity in the new division of the Bureau of Employment Security. We have seen to it in the report and in the actions which we have taken that the Veterans' Employment Service and the Employment Service generally shall not lose its identity and be subordinated to the unemployment-compensation group.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then you will give them a chance to grow? I have found them very effective. I have seen them work in California, Massachusetts, and elsewhere. If they have further assistance and cooperation, they will do much more.

Mr. KEEFE. All I can say to the gentleman is that the committee has repeatedly and repeatedly and repeatedly tried to implement the expressed attitude of the Congress of the United States. Legislation is needed to clarify the conflicting situation that now exists, in order to make clear in the law that these assistants that are out in the field have legislative authority behind their actions. It is rather in a nebulous condition as far as I am able to determine at the present time. The committee has called the attention of the Congress and its legislative committee time and again to the need for legislation to deal with that situation, and nothing has been done. I am repeating it again today and hope that some member of the proper legislative committee that has charge of this legislation will go to work and bring in some amendments to the fundamental law that will make clear just exactly what the situation should be in the matter of the Veterans' Employment Service.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman and the other members of the deficiency committee for bringing in an additional \$3,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration in connection with other work. It was a very great thing the gentleman did.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. May I remind the gentleman from Wisconsin and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] that I have always fully supported such items in this bill as mental health, dental health, social security, health in Alaska, and other such appropriations. You miss the point that I made a while ago. We hear so much talk on the other side of the aisle about what you are saving the American taxpayer. The point I made was that the President's budget estimates were correct. They were certainly correct in this instance because as far as a saving for the taxpayers is concerned, the cut amounts to only 1¼ percent in a bill carrying appropriations of almost \$1,000,000,000. We are tired of the talk we hear about New Deal laws. Why, your

Republican Party has been in control of the House of Representatives and the Senate for the past year and a half. What have you done about those laws if they are all wrong?

Mr. KEEFE. That is the usual argument that I expect to hear from an ardent New Dealer. I do not get irritated or cross any more when the gentleman makes his usual needling arguments which do not have very much effect on anybody who has any brains or intelligence and can understand the facts of a matter. If the gentleman wanted to be fair he would know that this is a supplemental estimate and that the major portion of the appropriations has already been reported. Just consider the other parts of the bill. Laughing out of the other side of his mouth, I have heard the gentleman from Rhode Island and the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. ROONEY] charge up and down the platforms of their respective States saying that I have been responsible for killing the Labor Department by taking away all its funds, or as I have heard them say on the floor of the House that we have made just puny little cuts and hardly pared anything from Government expenses. It seems to me that a sort of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde complex gets possession of my two good friends. They talk out of one side of their mouths one day to one class of people and out of the other side of their mouths some other day to another class of people. So far as I am concerned, I have stated my position clearly. I am going to cut every dollar out of these appropriations that we can cut and which will not interfere with the necessary services to the people of this country.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he heard I was going up and down Rhode Island accusing him?

Mr. KEEFE. Perhaps I had better withdraw that. I do not know that the gentleman ever did. I do not want to say that. I do not think the gentleman would do that because when he talks to his own people he perhaps tells them the facts, and I think that he would praise the gentleman from Wisconsin rather than say anything about him. I think what he says on the floor of the House here is just for the consumption of the Congress. I would not say that he had been too critical of me at any time. We got along pretty well this year, didn't we?

Mr. FOGARTY. We got along fairly well.

Mr. ROONEY. I am happy to say so.

Mr. KEEFE. I am happy to say so. I am sorry the gentleman was ill. He was ill this year and could not be at all the meetings of the committee. I was very seriously ill last year, but still I was able to be at those meetings. I know that the gentleman could not be there, but I had to be at those meetings. The Members who saw me on the floor of the House when the bill was reported last year will recall that some of them wondered how I was going to be able

to stand up and carry through until we finished with the bill, but I did. I am glad that I did because I know something about this bill—I have attended all the hearings on the bill and conducted the hearings on it. I know what is in the bill. It is unfortunate that the gentleman from New York was not there; of course, he could not be there—and therefore it is not to be expected that he would know very much of the facts or the background of this bill.

I would like to say one word about this terrible action of the committee, that was referred to by my good friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], when the committee inserted this language in the general provisions of the bill:

General limitations: No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who is a member of a labor organization, the officers of which have not complied with the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

I want to say that in my humble opinion I do not believe that either of my good friends from the minority side of our committee, down in their hearts object to that provision. I can not believe that they do. Knowing them as I do and their utter hatred and revulsion against the communistic penetration of labor unions, I cannot realize that they would. But I realize, of course, that the Communist outfit has now brought to the floor of the House and will bring to the floor by its official spokesman in the House, a brief that is intended and designed to show that the action of the committee is unconstitutional and every other thing.

Well, I have given some consideration to that, and I hope that my good friend from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will have an opportunity to speak on it. I want him to have the fullest opportunity to expound the philosophy which he expounded down here at the Willard Hotel before a group of Communists, near-Communists, and fellow travelers the other day when, under the inspiration of a bunch of Communist leaders, they got themselves together, after sending out three-hundred-odd telegrams, and the reports are that they had 48 in attendance, they got themselves organized to fight the efforts of Congress to deal with the menace of communism. I want the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to have full time to say anything he wants to.

I might say I have read the brief. I know he did not prepare it. I know where it comes from. I know the source of it. I have a copy of it, and I have read it. I am not at all impressed by it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is very rare that I find occasion to agree with him, but on this particular occasion and with regard to the principle of this rider, I am in 100-percent accord. There is only one purpose at which it is aimed, and that is to get rid of Communists in the Government service, and you can be assured of my support 100 percent in rid-

ding Communists out of Government agencies.

Mr. KEEFE. That is awfully nice of you to say that. I know that is the way you feel about it. You could not feel any other way. I do regret that part of the statement you made that you seldom agree with me, because on the major aspects of this legislation as we have presented it year after year, we have been in complete agreement. On all the great parts of this program, to which you have contributed, for the building up of the Public Health Service, social security, and grants of various nature, we have found ourselves in complete agreement. So that the divergencies and disagreements are not so great except when one party rises to throw a crack at some Republican on the other side.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman would not say we agreed on everything last year, would he?

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I think we did. You made a lot of talk as usual, but I noticed you voted pretty much the other way. I noticed that when the bill passed, it passed practically unanimously. That is the way it always is. We make a lot of noise on the floor, something for home consumption and all that sort of thing, that makes an appeal to our labor-union bosses in certain parts of the country, and they love to know that they have their people on the floor who are speaking and rising up in their behalf. But I am glad to see that the gentleman has arisen to the occasion of realization that here is a problem that affects not only Republicans and Democrats, but affects every American, and I am glad to see that we are on common ground in fighting this communistic penetration.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] will speak with his usual vehemence and apparent knowledge of the subject, that I suspect that most of his knowledge has been put into his hands by the astute managers of this communistic outfit.

I say what I am saying advisedly, and I regret it. I like Marc personally, but I utterly and completely despise his associations and his associates. I think it is high time that the American people and this Congress began to do something about it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield; yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I state to the gentleman, and to get it straight once and for all, that irrespective of how the gentleman may feel about my associations I prefer to be judged by what I say and what I do.

Mr. KEEFE. I am judging the gentleman not only by the associations he keeps but—let me tell a little story.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I complete my statement? Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am very proud that I am espousing the cause of these public workers.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. I do this in order to give the chairman of the subcommittee a chance to reply to the gentleman. Will the gentleman be cut off any time shortly?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I used?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin has used 51 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman will have plenty of time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; I will answer the gentleman in my own time.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; you answer me in your own time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But in the meantime I want to state that the agreement between gentlemen on the Republican side and the gentlemen on the Democratic side again proves that there is only one party in this country and that we need a new political party.

Mr. KEEFE. You see, usually clever! I remember some years ago when I was trying to earn money enough to go through school, the State of Wisconsin passed a law providing that if a country school would install a heating and ventilating system they would be subsidized out of the State treasury. I thought here was a chance for me to make some money by going out to the school districts in the territory where I resided and selling some of this heating and ventilating equipment. I thought it would be a simple thing, so I, young fellow, went out trying to get school boards together. I finally did get one school board together in a village across the lake from where I lived. They sat there with stony faces when I made my presentation and I asked:

"Well, gentlemen, does not this appeal?"

And one of the old fellows spoke up and said: "Oh, ve had a fellow around here couple years ago that sold us a chart and he said if only ve bought his chart ve could get rid of the teacher, they could teach themselves from the chart. Ve bought it and it turned out that he vas a crook."

Well, I asked, "Do I look like a crook?"

"Vell," he said, "You can't tell vot kind birds you got under de fedders."

And I asked: "Do my feathers look good to you?"

"Vell," he says, "I got to look under de fedders just a leetle beet, because you know ven you get crooks you find that birds of a fedder if you look deep enough always go mit."

His interpretation of "birds of a feather flock together."

That old philosophy has always stuck with me, and I am glad as a Republican and a member of the Republican Party that no charge has ever been leveled that we have harbored, given aid or comfort to, or assisted in any way, the despicable communistic conspiracy which exists throughout the world, and I know also in that behalf there are on the minority side almost with rare exception men and women who have similar beliefs. So far

as this Congress is concerned and so far as this country is concerned, the fight is on, Mr. MARCANTONIO.

You are carrying the fight for the other crowd and we intend to carry the fight for America and intend to carry out the pledges that we have made that we are going to protect this country wherever and whenever we can against the domination and sabotage of those who would destroy this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman might inquire into the record and background of the opponent that I had in the 1946 elections, a member of the American Labor Party who was endorsed by your Republican organization of Kings County in New York City and in New York State, even after I publicly called attention to what he stood for.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot inquire into that, because the politics of New York City and Brooklyn has always been an enigma to me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I would like to make a statement to the gentleman from Wisconsin before he leaves.

Mr. KEEFE. I am not going to leave. I am right here.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am glad you are here, physically anyway. May I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] that his opponent was not trying to overthrow the Government of the United States. He was simply trying to overthrow the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. ROONEY]. The two have not as yet become synonymous under our constitutional system.

Mr. KEEFE. Did you want me to hear that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. It might do you some good, I hope.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security appropriations has explained in pretty general terms just what this bill that we have before us this afternoon embodies. We are not in agreement on several portions of it. When the rule was under consideration I gave my reasons then why I thought the Subcommittee on Appropriations is taking over year after year more of the duties of the legislative committees of this House. When they find themselves in a position where they have to go to the Rules Committee to get protection in order to bring their bill on the floor of the House for consideration, it has come to the point of ineffective government, in my opinion.

Mr. Chairman, we have appropriation-wise taken the USES, the United States Employment Service, out of the Department of Labor and have put it in the Federal Security Administration.

The chairman of the committee was perfectly right when he gave a lot of deserving praise to the clerk of the full

committee, George Harvey, and our very efficient clerk of the subcommittee, Paul Wilson, because as I remember it, on the last day of the hearings on this bill I do not believe any of us on the Appropriations Committee knew where we were or what we were going to do or how we were going to write this particular bill.

I have read the bill three times now, and I still cannot get clear in my own mind as to just what has happened to some of the functions of USES, the UC, the Social Security Administration, and the Federal Security Administration itself. I know about where the cuts are, but with all these transfers back and forth under the Federal Security Administration it is very difficult for anyone of you to take up the report or the bill, or after reading the hearings, if you have had an opportunity to read them, and know just what is what at the present time.

The chairman has stated that this transfer would take effect anyway 6 months after the hostilities of this last war have been terminated. All he wants to do is to accelerate that action just a little bit. But, at the same time he is saying in effect that the committee, headed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], when it had the reorganization plan of the President up last February, did not know what it was doing and "We know how to do it better." If we are going to go along these lines from now on, you might just as well abolish all the legislative committees of this House and let all the subcommittees on appropriations do the legislating on all bills where we appropriate money, because that is just what is happening now in this Congress. I do not believe by this action today that you have any faith in the Hoover Commission that is working now to reorganize the executive branches of this Government. But here we take right out from underneath that commission something that they are working on and are supposed to report on to us in the next Congress in January 1949.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. It so happens that I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and one of the reasons advanced for the failure of the committee to approve the plan of the President was that the Hoover Commission was working on it. The argument at that time was, "What is the hurry? What is the hurry?"

Mr. FOGARTY. When the rule was under consideration earlier today I gave as my principal argument against the rule quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 25, 1948, when they opposed the reorganization plan, by giving that very same reason. Also every Senator in the other body that spoke against this plan gave that as the same reason. That was the reason only last February. That was the argument that they used then. Now, how can we expect a duly constituted legislative committee of this body, which has taken definite action on a matter of this kind, to take

a turn-about-face only 2 months after they have spoken on a piece of legislation such as this?

Now, we have done more than consolidate USES and the UC and the Federal Security Administration. We have cut the grants-in-aid to the States by \$22,650,000. What rhyme or reason or justification has been given for these cuts? When we had those who are responsible for these departments before our committee, they did not recommend any of these cuts. When the State representatives were before our committee there was no talk of cutting the grants to these States while they were testifying before our committee. But, after they had gone along and worked for 2 or 3 months in getting up the budget and presenting it to our committee, after full and complete hearings, they sit down for about an hour and say, "I guess we will lop off about \$22,000,000 for these grants-in-aid to the States." Is that a good way to legislate? The chairman has just said a short time ago that he does not like to legislate that way by just knocking off lump sums. But time and again that is just exactly what has been done by this committee, and we are cutting not in a proportionate way the UC funds and the unemployment funds. No. We are cutting 30 percent of the funds for the United States Employment Services and cutting the unemployment-compensation fund by only 10 percent.

These two functions of the Government are closely related. We know that we have to make these payments out of the unemployment-compensation fund. That is unemployment insurance. When a man is out of a job he is entitled to that money because he has paid into that fund. At the same time, we contend that the USES is just as important to the economy of this Government, and more important to the trust fund that we have established at the present time in unemployment compensation, because it is the duty of the USES when a man is unemployed to find a job for him and put him to work. That has been the program they have followed out. They do not want the man drawing unemployment-compensation benefits. They want to get that man in a position where he is earning his own way and not collecting these payments. That is why it is absolutely necessary to keep the employment services strong today to keep the men working.

One of the arguments used by the majority of this committee in making these cuts was, "Why, employment in this country is the highest in the history of this country." Certainly it is. It has good reason to be high. At the same time we have the highest labor turn-over in the history of the country at the present time. That is the reason we need a strong employment service now.

What else does the committee write into this bill? When we are talking about the appropriation for USES, we have four hundred-some-odd-thousand dollars for the Farm Placement Bureau, but we specifically state in our report that this money that is set apart for the placement of farm workers shall not be touched by those in control of the USES.

We set apart the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service and say that the USES, Mr. Goodwin and his officers, cannot touch one dime of it. Yet the \$22,650,000 that we have cut will be taken out of the services that are being rendered to the people of every State in the country at the present time. It is not affecting one section of the country, it is affecting every section of the country.

We had this first portion of the bill before us in March of this year. I said at that time that a year ago this subcommittee cut the appropriations for the Labor Department 44 percent. There is not another subcommittee on Appropriations in this House that has wielded the ax so fluently as this committee has against the Labor Department. Why that discrimination? This year when we had the appropriations before us we still cut the budget request of this year by 25 percent. We even went above the 44 percent of last year and cut 20 percent additional off what they had to work with in 1948. But when the Farm Placement Service comes along in this appropriation bill, is that touched or reduced accordingly, percentage-wise, in the over-all reduction of the bill? Oh, no.

They are well protected as they have been right down the line in every agricultural section of this country. We had one little insignificant thing in the appropriation bill this year for the library in the Labor Department, an increase of about five persons in the library of the Labor Department. We only have about 20 people in one of the finest libraries in the country. They are running way behind in their work. They have one of the ablest librarians of any library in the entire country. But could we get one dime for one additional employee for the Labor Department library? No. But the library in the Department of Agriculture has about 200 employees. They are well taken care of again. Now we come along following the same old pattern that has been followed for 5 or 6 years in the appropriation for the Labor Department. We find in this bill that we are further weakening and taking everything away from the Labor Department by taking the United States Employment Service out of the Labor Department and putting it in with the UC in the Federal Security Administration. I think there is something else behind this. I think there is perhaps a good reason for building the Federal Security Administration up into one of the biggest and strongest agencies in the Government. We are raising the salary of the Federal Security Administrator, Mr. Ewing, from \$12,000 to \$15,000. In other words, we are making a Cabinet position out of the Federal Security Administration. What business have we, as a Committee on Appropriations, to set up someone of Cabinet rank in the Federal Security Administration? It looks to me that if this pattern continues and this program continues as it has continued for the last 3 or 4 years, the intent might be to build the Federal Security Administration up to a point where it will be recognized as being of

Cabinet rank. Then the move will be to do away with the Labor Department and have it as a division of the Government under the Federal Security Administration.

I honestly think that is what might happen in the next 3 or 4 years if we keep on going as we are. The Republican leadership of the House should be proud of the program that they are following because it was one of their great Presidents who in 1913 established the Labor Department in this country when there were not half as many employed in industry as there are today. Now we have the largest number of employed people in the history of our country, and we find this committee cutting down year in and year out the functions that come under the Labor Department. It seems that every time the word "labor" is mentioned that is a good place to cut because it is popular to condemn labor and take away the rights and privileges of labor in some sections of the country. My good friend, the chairman of my committee, told you in his opening statement that we are giving the Veterans' Employment Service everything that they asked for. He is entirely right—we are giving them everything they ask for after a fashion. But what did this committee do a year ago? We want to make sure that the veterans get every bit of service that this Congress can render to them, but what was the argument a year ago when this same appropriation bill was before the House? We did not pay much attention then to the needs of the veterans, Mrs. ROGERS, when we cut the Veterans' Employment Service a year ago by about 40 percent. We did not take into consideration the needs of the veterans this year in this subcommittee, when along last March by another bit of legislation on this bill we decided to wipe out the Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division in the Department of Labor. When they requested some \$400,000, this committee wiped out that division that was handling the affairs of the veterans of this country by eliminating the entire amount. That is the way the House passed the bill on March 8.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact that this bill carries the exact budget estimate submitted for the Veterans' Employment Service?

Mr. FOGARTY. I said that. I said we are giving them exactly what they asked for, but we cut them about 40 percent a year ago.

Mr. KEEFE. You are complaining about what the Congress did last year?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am just reminding the Congress of your friendship to the veterans a year ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, I am not a member

of the Committee on Appropriations. I was very much interested in having adequate appropriations, as the gentleman knows, for the veterans' reemployment service. I would like to ask the assistance of the gentleman in securing the passage of an amendment to the GI bill of rights which is generally considered to be really the only veterans' bill which we have before the Congress. We will have it before the Congress shortly for action. That will provide for low rental houses and apartment houses for the veterans. I know the gentleman will help secure the passage of that bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. There will be no question about that.

But when we start talking about talking out of one side of your mouth one day and the other side of your mouth the next day, when you look at the record, we are talking about giving the veterans something now—but this is an election year. A year ago when we on the Democratic side offered an amendment to restore that cut in the bill it was turned down by a two to one vote in this House by the Republican majority. Earlier this year when we had up a bill for the veterans' reemployment rights the Republican majority eliminated the entire division having to do with the reemployment rights of the veterans of this country. If that is not talking out of one side of your mouth one day and the other side the next day I do not know what talking out of both sides of your mouth at the same time means.

I have always been an advocate of the United States Employment Service. I have always believed that it should be in the Department of Labor. It originated in the Department of Labor back in the year 1918 and was continuously there until 1939. When the Wagner-Peyser Act was passed in 1933 it was then a part of the Labor Department. The chairman of our committee in his talk today explained how it was back and forth, through Executive orders and otherwise, first Federal Security Agency, the War Manpower Commission, and finally put back into the Department of Labor a year or two ago. I think if I remember correctly, the chairman of our committee was reported as saying in the Record somewhere along the line at that time: "It is about time it was put back in the Department of Labor. That is where it belongs." It seems to me I read that in the hearings a year or two ago.

There is a close tie-up of the Employment Service with the functions of the Department of Labor, much closer than any other department of our Government. The employment services are tied up with almost every division in the Department of Labor. They are tied up to a certain extent with the Wage and Hour Division. That is tied up to a certain extent to the Apprenticeship Training Division in the Department of Labor. They are tied up to a certain extent with the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. They are tied up to a certain extent to the Division of Labor Standards in the Department of Labor. We have a labor force now of over 60,000,000 people employed in this country. We have a Labor Department to give

service to the working classes of this country, and practically 95 or 96 percent of those 60,000,000 employees have something to do with either unemployment compensation or USES.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I disagree entirely with the report of the committee on establishing the USES in the Office of the Federal Security Administration. I do not believe, however, there will be much opportunity of having any consideration given to splitting this up and leaving it as it is today, but I do hope when it gets over into the other body that they will leave it as it is if they do not consolidate unemployment compensation along with the USES in the Department of Labor. I have been trying to find in this report where some of these cuts are, but it is quite difficult. In the office of the Social Security Administrator, Mr. Alt-meyer, they have cut out practically all of the money for the publications and review division and the national service of the Social Security Administration.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I direct the gentleman's attention to page 23 of the report? He says he is unable to understand the cuts, transfers, and so on. If he will turn to page 23 he will observe that there is a table which shows the break-down in detail right to the very dollar; and following that each one of those proposed transfers and cuts is discussed in detail in a separate paragraph. If the gentleman would take time to read the report of the committee of which he is a member, I am sure he would be able to understand exactly what the cuts are and what they are related to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have read this report four times now. Perhaps I am not as bright as the gentleman is. I realize that he is an authority on the Labor Department and the Federal Security Administration. I do not take one thing away from the gentleman because I know he thoroughly understands the operation of every division in that department of the Government. I have been on this committee only 2 years. All this is new to me and sometimes it takes me a little longer to get it through my head as to just what happens.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman that I tried to explain my statement. It is technical. It is difficult. It is difficult and technical for anybody, and it is just hard, consistent work that will permit anybody to understand it because of the complexity and detail of all these set-ups in the Federal Security Agency and especially the Social Security Administration, but we have tried to make it as clear as the A B C's in the table and the following explanations. I am sure the gentleman is fully competent to understand it, and I am sure that he does and will if he just reads that statement. It will show the transfers and the cuts and everything else clearly.

Mr. FOGARTY. I will be willing to wager, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill has passed this House not over 15

Members who vote for it will know what is in the bill or in the report.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, if he will permit me, whether or not the Research and Statistics Division of the Social Security Administration has been cut 50 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. It has been cut more than 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. I can give that to the gentleman. The Bureau of Research and Statistics had 54 positions and asked for an appropriation of \$229,830. It has been cut \$129,830.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It has been cut then more than 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. It has been cut to \$100,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It has been cut practically 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. A little less than 50 percent.

Mr. FOGARTY. More than 50 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. It is cut \$129,000, which leaves \$100,000.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the Research and Statistics Division is to a large extent the nerve center of the whole operation of the Social Security Service? It is absolutely necessary to keep up this Bureau of Research and Statistics in order that the Congress may be properly advised as to what type of coverage to extend and how much greater benefits shall be granted, as proclaimed by both parties?

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes; I am asking the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the gentleman will yield to me for this one answer, I will appreciate it. Is it a fact that this division that has been cut is the actual nerve center of the whole operation of the Social Security Administration?

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the gentleman he is simply reiterating the contention that has frequently been made by the flock of jobholders who find security in this particular division of the Social Security Administration. To categorically answer the gentleman's question, my answer is no.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad that the gentleman is frank about it, and I am glad to have him on record.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, when we come to the Office of the Social Security Administrator, the committee allowed all but \$211.

The Coordinating and Procedural Division, which has to do with supervision and control, has been eliminated entirely without one thing in the hearings about whether it was necessary or not. The committee has taken this action by saying, "Well, that is one place we can cut. We will eliminate that division entirely."

In the Personnel and Business Management Section the estimate embraced 128 positions. The agency suggested a transfer of 29 and has also proposed to transfer 15 positions to the Office of Administrator, 14 to the Social Security Library, and 1 to handle personnel replacement and recruitment work for the Administrator's office.

The Publications and Review Division, and Information Service, I think are very necessary. I have asked for information and I make inquiries of the Social Security Administration time and time again in the course of a year. What did we do on its budget? They asked for a total of \$109,997, or 24 positions for these 2 units. What did we give them? We gave them \$20,000. Why in the world they left in the measly \$20,000 I do not know, because it takes away all of the services they are giving now to Members of Congress, to employers, and to employees all over the country. With the whole social-security program now in the process of being revalued, probably enlarged and taking in more scope than it does at the present time, there is more need for a division like this than ever before in the Social Security Administration. But do they pay any attention to that? No. Here is an easy way of knocking off \$100,000, so that is what they did. In the Training Division there was a small item of \$16,445. I think maybe three or four positions that are necessary in an establishment that has 12,000 employees. Is it not good business management to have three or four men who can train these employees in technical services and otherwise? But the committee did not see fit to even include that small sum of \$16,000 for three or four men in that branch.

In the Bureau of Research and Statistics they cut them almost 60 percent. They reduced the budget estimate from \$229,800 to \$100,000. I am not talking, Mr. Chairman, because some of these employees have come to me and because they are losing their jobs. I would not know 10 men down in that whole Division of Social Security or Federal Security Administration, outside of the times I have met them before the committee when they were up here for their budget requests. But it does not seem like good business management, with an agency that is responsible perhaps for \$2,000,000,000 that they handle in a year, to be cutting down their administrative expenses in such a manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself four additional minutes.

On the dental-health program that I know my chairman is very much interested in, I think he would personally have favored the full budget request. I am sorry that the committee did not see fit to give the full budget request on this dental-health program. The full budget request was for some three million-odd dollars, and we allowed a flat sum of \$1,000,000, as the chairman has stated, to provide 50 mobile units to put on these demonstrations in training personnel. The original request, I think, was for \$1,500,000 to train hygienists to apply

these sodium fluoride treatments to the children's teeth. I think we should have granted that amount. In the new budget request they asked for some \$161,000 for publicity programs. This is something new, I think we all wanted to give it to every child in this country. We are all working toward that end. But, there is a small item of \$161,000 to publicize this discovery, which is the greatest discovery ever made in the care of dental health; the first time in the history of dental care that we have come up with something that will prevent the decay of teeth in children by 50 percent. We only allow the small item of \$161,000 to publicize this throughout the country. I hope that the committee will allow the full amount.

In the mental-health program we have given them everything they have asked for and more. They have been well taken care of. There was one thing I mentioned in my earlier talk on USES and the UC funds.

One of the arguments used for reducing this budget was that we now have the highest employment in the history of the country, so why do we need to spend so much money? Costs are going up and up and up, and where are they going to stop? What we should tell the Congress is that the Administrator of this program, the USES, came in and asked for an additional amount of money this year because he has additional responsibilities the Congress wants him to perform. At the same time he asked for an additional amount, the budget estimate came up with some 540 employees less than he had in 1948. The reason for the request is the additional responsibilities that Congress has asked him to assume, and the raise in salaries in all the States in the Union. They have been giving these raises and there is nothing we can do about it. There is no question in my mind that the employees deserve those raises. In view of all this, the committee has taken the over-all action just across the board, and said to the States men, to this States group, to every State in the Union, "Your organization promised us economy in 1947 and 1948, when you said that if this program was returned to the States you would cut costs. Now we are going to make you prove it or eat your own words."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, the action of the Appropriations Committee in decimating the staff of the Commissioner for Social Security is in complete accord with other actions of this Congress in weakening social security. This House has already passed one bill to deprive employee news vendors of social-security coverage, as well as another bill—House Joint Resolution 296—which would take away the protection of some 750,000 workers and their families granted by a Democratic Congress back in 1935. Still other legislation is pending to repeal benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act.

Of course, there is more than one way to skin a cat. The majority now strike at the nerve centers of the social-security

system cutting by nearly 60 percent the Research and Statistics Division in Social Security. This is the office that supplies the committees of Congress with facts and figures on which to legislate. These people have years of experience in the detailed operations of social security. By approving the cuts recommended and proposed in the pending measure, we are going to deprive the Congress of the services of indispensable personnel.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to congratulate and thank the chairman the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and members of the committee for reporting a special item of \$700,000 for health work in Alaska. It is needed and badly needed, and had it not been for the fine cooperation of the committee, there would have been no possibility of starting this health program in the Territory this year.

Alaska, by its peculiar position on the globe, has become the crossroads of aerial world trade routes and more recently the strategic military significance of Alaska has suddenly been appreciated. The late Gen. Billy Mitchell, prophet of American air power, declared, "He who holds Alaska will hold the world." Alaska is now being referred to as the left flank in the defense of the North American Continent and when we carefully analyze the statement of Secretary Symington that from bases in Alaska and Labrador, Asia and Europe could be bombed, we know that this land is a very precious possession. In order to make Alaska a bulwark of defense, rapid development is essential. There is already significant migration and by people who desire to make it their permanent home. There are others who are needed by the thousands for the great defense activities and as has been recently announced, the Department of Defense has indicated that more intensive training will take place in Alaska for the purpose of conducting arctic warfare.

It hardly seems necessary to mention the importance in preparing for a rapidly developing country that adequate basic health services must be made available. This includes a complete public-health program, adequate hospital facilities, sufficient qualified physicians and other trained personnel to do the work and the establishment of facilities to conduct Arctic scientific investigations.

At this point I should like to bring to your attention some of the conditions that exist in Alaska that this appropriation will set about correcting. Our territorial officials and Department of Health have done as much as has been possible for them to do to attack these problems. Definite progress and success can be demonstrated but the task is of such tremendous proportions that it is not possible for them to control completely the spread of communicable diseases and give adequate health protection. Indeed, conditions are so serious that it becomes necessary to refer to it as an emergency. This emergency situation is developed by reason of the fact that there are such tremendous developments taking place and contemplated in

the immediate future for Alaska that we cannot stand by idly and permit health conditions to continue as they are. It is conceivable that Alaska—a country which is one-fifth the area of the United States and perfectly capable of having a population of several millions—could through gradual and normal expansion meet these problems. But, in view of the fact that many thousands of people are needed there soon it is highly essential that basic public-health protection, which we offer to the American citizens in continental United States, be made available now for the Americans who are migrating to Alaska to make it truly a bastion of defense.

What are some of these serious conditions that have been neglected and what does this appropriation propose to do to correct them?

TUBERCULOSIS IS SCOURGE

Tuberculosis is correctly referred to as the scourge of Alaska.

One out of every five deaths in Alaska is caused by tuberculosis. Many of these are children who die from meningitis which their tuberculous mothers gave them. The over-all death rate from tuberculosis in the United States in 1946 was 40.1 per 100,000 population while in Alaska it was 359.1.

The incidence is even higher among the Native peoples—Eskimos, Indians, and Aleuts. That death rate is 16 times the average tuberculosis death rate in the United States. Even among nonnative groups the rate is twice that of the United States and this is not counting the many white patients who have moved out of Alaska to receive treatment too late. There are hundreds of known cases of bone tuberculosis, many of which have already caused permanent crippling conditions in children.

IT IS PREVENTABLE

The horrible tragedy is that tuberculosis is a communicable disease. It must be transmitted from person to person, mother to child, sister to sister, and so forth, and because of this even a non-tuberculous family can become infected when an open active case moves in to live with them. This spread is particularly serious among native people who live in small, substandard, poorly ventilated houses. Alaska's weather dictates this congested living, since the cost of heating small houses is kept down. So it does not take long for an entire household to contract tuberculosis when someone living there brings it home. A native mother has said, "Only 5 of my 15 babies living; others all die TB." And that is readily understood when the husband has bilateral far-advanced tuberculosis with cavitation and now is dying right in that home. The tragedy is that this family would not have had TB if someone else had not transmitted it to the father in the first place—quite innocently to be sure.

THERE IS HOPE

Can this chain of infection be broken? Yes; it is possible and Alaskans are pledged to do just that. They know it can and must be done for the good of their country. Today Alaskans are traveling much more. They come from remote villages by boat and train, but

chiefly by plane, to centers of population where there is a doctor. Before, they were doomed to die in lonely villages without any medical aid. Increased travel, however, brings about a greater intermingling of people and it must be remembered tuberculosis is no respecter of race.

ALASKANS ACT

Alaskans, in 1946, at an extraordinary session of the Territorial legislature, passed an all-inclusive Tuberculosis Control Act and appropriated \$250,000 to carry out the purposes of the act. This, for Alaska, was a large sum, for it was one-tenth of its entire annual appropriation for government services of all types. An intensive program of case-finding through mass chest X-ray surveys was established. Today over 40 percent of the population has been X-rayed. What has been found is appalling. In one village on the Aleutian chain 20 percent of the population has active tuberculosis. This is not an unusual percentage, either. In State-side surveys one could expect to find about a 1-percent incidence in those examined.

Statistics were studied and a central case register started. Alaskans believed in its program and again appropriated nearly a quarter of a million dollars for 1947 and 1948 to continue the fight against tuberculosis.

WE CANNOT DO IT ALONE

But Alaska cannot do the job alone. The task is too great. Case-finding, care, and hospitalization cost tremendous sums for this is a disease that necessitates long-term hospitalization. The United States Public Health Service is helping through grants-in-aid of about \$114,000 annually, assignment of full-time personnel and consultation services. However, the real need from the Federal Government is the construction of sanatoria—1,000 beds are needed—for the 4,000 cases of known tuberculosis, and sufficient funds to care for the patients who are Federal beneficiaries. More aid on the part of the Federal Government must be forthcoming now if this scourge is to be controlled. A health department field physician, returning to an area surveyed last year reported:

We were very depressed when we went to Tetlin to hear of the people who died last winter. You should have seen the look on John Andrews' face when he told us that two of his children had died and all he hears is talk, talk, talk; no doctor, no hospital. Give these people another 10 years and we won't have to worry about Tetlin. I so hope the beds and funds will come soon. Will they?

This bill proposes to intensify the case-finding and related control activities. It will give increased home nursing service to patients with TB until such time as enough sanatorium beds are made available. It will be possible to establish a BCG vaccination program. This is a method of vaccination against tuberculosis. This is an approach to the problem that will bring long-term results and will be instituted at once under the provisions of the appropriation now before you.

ALARMING SITUATION

It hardly seems necessary to emphasize the importance in a defense area, as

Alaska is rapidly becoming, for the adequate control of the spread of venereal diseases. It must be stated very flatly that the venereal diseases are on the increase in Alaska and are not being controlled. Their spread has been rapid since the beginning of defense activities started in 1940. These diseases are not only on the increase in large towns but are spreading to small communities where there was no evidence of them before. The spread is of immediate concern to us all for the seeding of previously uninfected vicinities with gonorrhea with its genital, urinary, and eye complications in areas without a physician's services leads not only to invalidism in adults but touches the children at birth. The ravages of syphilis are spreading and bringing death to many infants born to infected parents and crippling adults during their years of usefulness. From an economic standpoint a diseased populace is a burden to society. There should be no excuse for delay in controlling venereal disease before its ravages have reached too far. Curbing venereal disease now will save countless lives and dollars in the future. All of us know the serious aspects of and time lost from venereal diseases among the many troops and defense workers. It is regrettable to have to admit that with the funds available and the personnel now in Alaska, the venereal diseases cannot be controlled. The program contemplated under this appropriation is simply one of getting enough personnel to go into the areas in which venereal disease exists, and is spreading, control it by immediate and effective treatment using recognized rapid treatment methods. It will also establish and intensify educational programs and bring about effective enforcement of laws and regulations so that the spread of venereal diseases can be controlled effectively on a permanent basis.

NEED FOR SANITATION

Alaska is faced with basic insanitation. There are very few water supplies that are adequate to meet the demands placed upon them by reason of an ever-increasing population. Many communities do not have what can be referred to as safe water supplies. Sewage disposal, garbage collection, and general and environmental sanitation of restaurants, food-handling establishments, and so forth, must be improved and in many instances instituted. Conditions peculiar to the Arctic such as permafrost, which is a condition where the ground freezes down to an undetermined depth with only a surface crust thawing out each summer, needs scientific investigation. The usual processes of purification and bacterial action do not exist in the Arctic. The need for improving basic sanitation to make a community livable hardly needs to be stressed further. This program will make it possible to employ an adequate number of well-trained and qualified sanitary engineers and sanitarians. They must make the necessary investigations in order to be in a position to give reliable information and advice. They will serve as consultants to engineers but of most importance they will participate in direct service in the many communities that have not here-

tofore received any assistance whatsoever. Through these engineers and sanitarians water which is now deemed impure will be made safe. Sewage systems that are inadequate and overloaded will have qualified engineers investigate and make recommendations for corrections.

It is gratifying to me to note that our health officials have included in this emergency appropriation a considerable item to begin immediately field investigations along scientific lines as they relate to health. It is difficult to state categorically that these basic scientific investigations are of more or less importance than the direct services which I have referred to above. We Americans have long known the importance of research and careful studies to get at the basic causes for disease and I cannot emphasize too strongly how urgently this type of work is needed in Alaska.

FAR BEHIND RUSSIA

I fear that we have already delayed too long. We knew before World War II that Russia was making great progress in scientific investigations, research, experimentation, in Siberia—which you know is only 54 miles across the Bering Sea from Alaska—but nowhere in the United States of America or Alaska are the simplest academic scientific facts known about conditions as they exist in the arctic and how they affect all of the various aspects of health. It is a known fact that during World War II the Army began such investigations but under the stress and urgency of war conditions these research studies were of little value. I know that now such studies are being instituted by the Army and the Navy on a rather small scale and the tragedy is that they are being conducted with inadequate facilities.

This has been brought to my attention so effectively in recent weeks that I introduced a resolution into this House on April 27 which will authorize the construction of adequate research laboratories in the arctic which will make it possible for the United States Public Health Service and the military forces to conduct studies that they deem urgent and essential in order that we will have some basic information about the Arctic where we regrettably fear many thousands of American citizens may someday be stationed.

As I have stated above, I am pleased that this appropriation will make it possible for field investigations to be started at once without waiting until the construction is completed of an Arctic Institute of Health.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Committee to the language on line 5, page 17, of the bill. That is to be read in connection with the first sentence of section 9. There we find the following:

No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person—

Then go over to page 17 and continue—who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have not complied with

the requirements of subsection (h) of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

Subsection (h) of section 9 as amended referred to in this language is the section of the Taft-Hartley law which provides that officers of unions must file non-Communist affidavits, non-Communist affiliation oaths; and the penalty for not filing such affidavits is the deprivation of National Labor Relations Board rights of the members of those unions.

This language goes way beyond the Taft-Hartley law; it singles out the Government employees. Under the Taft-Hartley law, the member of such union is deprived of the right to avail himself of the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act as amended. The proviso in this bill deprives the Government employee of his job.

Let us examine this proviso without hysteria. It applies to the United Public Workers of America. It applies also to the ITU members, the people who are employed in the Government Printing Office, and it applies to several other organizations whose members are employed by the Government. While it is true that this proviso is restricted just to this appropriation bill, it is no secret that this proviso will be attached to every other appropriation bill, and if I am wrong in that respect I ask the chairman of the subcommittee to correct me. So this proviso will apply to every Government employee who belongs to a labor organization whose officials have not filed these non-Communist affidavits; and while the Taft-Hartley law deprives labor of the benefits of rights under the National Labor Relations law, this language deprives Government employees of their jobs.

Let us analyze the situation further. If a minority of such a union should vote in favor of having their officers file such affidavits but will not withdraw from the union because of the benefits that have accrued to them through years of membership in such union, those members will be punished, they will be deprived of their jobs. Let us go a step further. If that question of the filing of non-Communist affidavits is not a matter for the membership to pass upon, still the members of that union will be deprived of their jobs under this language. The proponents of this language will say, of course, "Why do these members not leave the union?" There is a good reason for their not leaving the union. First, there is the fundamental right of Americans to belong to any union of their choice, the right of the Government employees to belong to any union of their choice, guaranteed in the La Follette Act of 1912, which I hold here in my hand and which I make a part of my remarks:

UNITED STATES CODE ANNOTATED, TITLE 5

Chapter 12, section 652: Removals from classified civil service only for cause. No person in classified civil service of the United States shall be removed therefrom except for such cause as will promote the efficiency of said service and for reasons given in writing, and the person whose removal is sought shall have notice of the same and of any charges preferred against him, and be furnished with a copy thereof, and also be allowed a reasonable time for personally an-

swering the same in writing; and affidavits in support thereof, but no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer making the removal; and copies of charges, notice of hearing, answer, reasons for removal, and of the order of removal shall be made a part of the records of the proper department or office, as shall also the reasons for reduction in rank or compensation; and copies of the same shall be furnished to the person affected upon request, and the Civil Service Commission also shall, upon request, be furnished copies of the same. Membership in any society, association, club, or other form of organization of postal employees not affiliated with any outside organization imposing an obligation or duty upon them to engage in any strike, or proposing to assist them in any strike, against the United States, having for its objects, among other things, improvements in the condition of labor of its members, including hours of labor and compensation therefor and leave of absence, by any person or groups of persons in said postal service, or the presenting by any such person or groups or (of) persons of any grievance or grievances to the Congress or any Member thereof shall not constitute or be cause for reduction in rank or compensation or removal of such person or groups of persons from said service. The right of persons employed in the civil service of the United States, either individually or collectively, to petition Congress, or any Member thereof, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to any committee or member thereof, shall not be denied or interfered with. (Aug. 24, 1912, ch. 389, § 37 Stat. 55.)

Second, there is the economic reason. Members have accrued benefits which have come to them as the result of years of membership in a union. Now you ask them to make a choice of either losing their jobs or losing the benefits that have been accrued.

That is what Government workers will be up against with this language being written into this bill. May I say that the language was written into the bill without a hearing before the committee. Before the subcommittee itself no hearing was held. Before the full committee no hearing was held.

The gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to sell this to the Congress by an old, ancient technique, the technique of raising the Red bogey. This language, he says, is aimed at removing Communists from the Government. I have heard the gentleman sing that song here so often it is becoming very stale. What would he say, for instance, if the coal mines were being operated by the Government? Would he say that John L. Lewis is a Communist? Does he say that the ITU is communistic? The leaders of both of these labor organizations have not signed the oath. Further, what about the first amendment to the Constitution? What about the Bill of Rights?

The purpose of this language is to impose upon Government employees a superrestriction way beyond that which was written in the Taft-Hartley law. But, of course, the gentleman from Wisconsin having a bad case has to wave the "red herring" to sell this vicious anti-labor provision.

I now deal for a moment with one or two of the extraneous matters which the gentleman from Wisconsin injected in order to confuse the real issue. You know, when I was a young boy I used

to read an old cartoon of Hawkshaw, the detective. Old Hawkshaw would go around and go through an awful lot of motions, when right under his nose in the very first portion of the cartoon the mystery was solved, only he could not see it. Hawkshaw, after going through a lot of motions and carrying on through a page of cartoons, would finally solve the mystery. He would at last see something that had been right under his nose all the time.

The gentleman from Wisconsin got up here today and tried to make you believe he was investigating a great mystery. He said, "I have on my desk there a memorandum on the constitutionality of this law. I know who prepared it. The gentleman from New York distributed it, but he did not write it. I know who prepared it." What a secret, what a Hawkshaw, what a detective. When I distributed copies of this brief yesterday I stated that it had been prepared by the United Public Workers of America. He is leading you to believe here that it was a great subversive activity, a great conspiratorial secret that he was uncovering, something which I proclaim loudly and proudly.

The gentleman from Wisconsin goes to extremes in his attempt to sell this anti-labor law to this Congress by raising the old communistic bogey. It is a bogey that has developed into quite a racket. You know, I sometimes wonder what would happen to some of the gentlemen of this House if all the Communists should die tomorrow morning. A lot of gentlemen in this House would find themselves at a loss. They would have to find themselves a new racket, otherwise they would be forced to stand up before their constituents and explain their failure to do anything on housing, their failure to do anything on veterans' legislation, the damage they have done to labor, their failure to bring down the cost of living, what they have been doing to civil rights and the peace of the American people. The Red bogey has been the most convenient vehicle for legislative deception.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, this Communist bogey is raised time and time again to conceal the inactivity of Members here on behalf of the people and to conceal their activity on behalf of the entrenched interests in these United States.

The gentleman from Wisconsin by his diatribe on communism would make you believe that he is the protector of America; this self-assumed monopoly on patriotism which was displayed here this morning by him should be recalled in the light of his similar past performances. You new Members were not here in 1943. You should have heard his speech on the Dodd-Watson-Lovett cases here. You should have heard his speech on section 504 of that deficiency appropriation bill that we had here in 1943. It is basically the same speech as the one he delivered here this morning. The same self-righteousness and flag-waving oratory.

Mark Twain tells of a steamboat on the old Mississippi River that had a

6-inch whistle and a 2-inch boiler, and every time the whistle blew the boat stopped, and that boat huffed and puffed and huffed and puffed to get along. The gentleman from Wisconsin reminds me of the huffing and puffing of this 6-inch whistle and 2-inch boiler boat. He huffed and puffed here in 1943 when he gave us the same speech that he gave you today, and remember we have before us identically the same situation today.

Now, my idea of Americanism is to support the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. And I say that when the Supreme Court has handed down law on this question, it comes in my opinion close to subversivism to try to enact in this Congress that which the Supreme Court of the United States said you could not do; that which the Supreme Court said was a violation of the Constitution; that which the Supreme Court declared to be violation of the Bill of Rights. The deliberate attempt to do that is, in my considered judgment, far, far from Americanism and close, close, close to Fascist subversiveness.

In the Dodd-Watson-Lovett case we had a similar provision as we have here. There we mentioned three individuals and we said that no part of the appropriation was to be paid to them in the form of a salary. Now I want to read from the opinion of the Court in United States against Lovett. The gentleman from Wisconsin made this Congress go through with that proposition by the same speech that he made here. Yes; I remember the gentleman's speech.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman compliments me when he says I made the Congress go through. I think the gentleman will recall that the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton Anderson, made the speech with respect to Mr. Dodd. Does the gentleman recall that?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, of course.

Mr. KEEFE. And it was a Democratic committee that reported this action here to this Congress. The gentleman has gone a long way to charge that the gentleman from Wisconsin forced that thing through.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Oh, how the gentleman loves to dodge.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I do not dodge.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is a champion dodger this afternoon. He wins the prize. The gentleman made a speech advocating the adoption of section 304, did he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Did he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Certainly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now the gentleman wants to say, "Teacher, I did not do it; the Democrats did it."

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, no. I made a speech for it, definitely.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman made a speech for it, did he not?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly; and he used identically the same language. He huffed and puffed just like that steamboat did. He used the same language, and he blew up this big anti-Communist balloon and he carried it on

the floor of this House, and when it got to the Supreme Court they put a pin in that balloon and it burst right in his face.

Now, I want to read from the Court's language and I want the membership of this House to follow what the Supreme Court said on this proposition strongly advocated by the gentleman from Wisconsin who today is trying to dodge his share of the responsibility which caused that disgraceful action on the part of the Congress and which was subsequently rejected by the Supreme Court of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I have some time to read this Supreme Court decision?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Follow this language. Supreme Court Justice Black, in his opinion for the Court in the Dodd-Watson-Lovett case in discussing section 304, which the gentleman from Wisconsin helped to put over in this House, said as follows:

We hold that section 304 falls precisely within the category of congressional actions which the Constitution barred by providing that "No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed." In *Cummings v. Missouri* (4 Wall 277, 323), this Court said, "A bill of attainder is a legislative act which inflicts punishment without a judicial trial. If the punishment be less than death, the act is termed a bill of pains and penalties. Within the meaning of the Constitution, bills of attainder include bills of pains and penalties."

The Cummings decision involved a provision of the Missouri Reconstruction Constitution which required persons to take an oath of loyalty as a prerequisite to practicing a profession. Cummings, a Catholic priest, was convicted for teaching and preaching as a minister without taking the oath. The oath required an applicant to affirm that he had never given aid or comfort to persons engaged in hostility to the United States and had never "been a member of, or connected with, any order, society, or organization, inimical to the Government of the United States." In an illuminating opinion which gave the historical background of the constitutional prohibition against bills of attainder, this Court invalidated the Missouri constitutional provision both because it constituted a bill of attainder and because it had an ex post facto operation. On the same day the Cummings case was decided, the Court, in *Ex parte Garland* (4 Wall. 333), also held invalid on the same grounds an act of Congress which required attorneys practicing before this Court to take a similar oath. Neither of these cases has ever been overruled. They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals—

Now, get this—

or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution. Adherence to this principle requires invalidation of section 304. We do adhere to it.

This is Americanism, Mr. KEEFE, and not huffing and puffing in the old anti-Communist balloon.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to say just a word or two, in a general way, with respect to the pending bill, making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1949, which was reported by my Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

It will be recalled that when we reported the regular Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill we deferred action on certain items until we had opportunity to inquire into them in greater detail. At the time the regular appropriation bill was presented to the House the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1948 was pending for consideration. Not knowing what the final action would be on the reorganization plan, whether the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security were to be administered by the Labor Department or the Federal Security Agency, we were not in a position to act intelligently on the budgetary estimates.

We have since acted on the reorganization plan. With the adoption of the resolution rejecting the proposal, the United States Employment Service will automatically revert to the Federal Security Agency from the Labor Department 6 months after the official end of the war is declared. That action having been taken, the committee is thus able to make the appropriation on a sound basis as recommended in the pending bill. It having been determined by the Congress that the Federal Security Agency, and not the Labor Department, should have charge of the Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security, the pending bill provides for the consolidation of these two operations without further delay.

I do not intend to rehash the arguments as to whether these particular functions should be administered by the Federal Security Agency or the Labor Department. That question has been decided by the Congress. It having been decided that the Federal Security Agency should administer both the Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security, it behooves us to see that this is done at the earliest possible date and that funds be appropriated on a basis that will best realize an effective and economical operation.

Anyone who has examined the hearings before our committee cannot but be impressed with the detailed care taken by the committee in an examination of this specific matter. We have talked and talked about the duplications, and the resulting waste, in the organizational set-up of the Federal Government. We have frequently assured our constituents that we would act to eliminate the duplications and overlappings. Insofar as the related functions of employment service and unemployment compensation are concerned, we have by this bill fulfilled that pledge to the people.

The bill proposes the consolidation of the United States Employment Service and the present Bureau of Employment Security into a single bureau. To carry out these two programs, which are clearly related, the bill makes a single appropriation of \$123,000,000, instead of two separate appropriations to two separate

agencies of the Government. This is \$22,650,000 below the budget estimates.

During the course of the debate on the bill we will doubtless hear the usual cry that by this reduction in the budget estimates we are crippling these services. That is the argument that is advanced on practically every economy proposal, and that is why it is so difficult to achieve economy in government. Those who have their pet projects or pet governmental activities are always opposed to any reduction in the operations in which they are especially interested.

But the reduction proposed by this bill in no way will interfere with the proper and effective carrying out of the programs. When we returned the employment offices to the States, about 2 years ago, we were told that the system could be more economically operated by the States. And there is every reason to believe that it should be. Notwithstanding, the appropriations for the service have been on the increase. It just does not make sense for the Federal appropriations for a function to increase when, at the same time, the activities of the Federal Government in a particular field are intended to be purely supervisory.

Moreover, our committee cannot understand why such large appropriations should be requested for the Employment Service when we are at an all-time high in employment. The situation confronting us today is certainly not the same as confronted us during the depression. And, certainly, there are no immediate prospects, at least not for the coming fiscal year, for any decrease in employment.

Here again is an illustration of how bureaucracy grows and grows like a cancerous disease. The purpose of the Employment Service is to assist employees in securing jobs for which they are qualified and to assist employers in securing the people to fill the jobs they have available. In short, it is to bring the job and the man together. I recognize it has its value even in times of full employment, as the labor market is never static; but I shall never be convinced that there is the need for this type of service on a larger scale today than during a period of unemployment. Yet the Bureau continues to grow and its officials continue to present reasons for "bigger and better" appropriations, so to speak.

I am sure that if the Members take the time to go through the hearings of our committee on the various items in connection with this bill they will be impressed with the thoroughness with which we explored each and every one. You will note from the tables embodied in the committee report that some of the items were increased over the budget estimates. I mention this simply as an indication that our attitude has not been to reduce summarily and arbitrarily every budget recommendation. When a particular expenditure could be fully justified, the committee recommended it, but where an expenditure did not appear to have justification, we did not hesitate to reduce it. That is the only way to achieve economy.

Eliminating the large item of \$797,000,000 as grants to States for public assistance, which represents a specific

amount that the Federal Government is obliged to appropriate under existing law, our committee has been able to realize a reduction of approximately 10 percent below the budget estimates. And, I say again, we have done this without in the slightest degree interfering with any essential activity or in any way hindering the programs involved.

The expenditures of the Government have long been a matter of great concern to me. They are a matter of great concern to the people we represent. I frankly have not been entirely satisfied with what we have been able to accomplish thus far for achieving economy. As I view it, there is too much of a disposition on the part of the individual Members and on the part of the committees who are interested in certain specific matters to look only at their particular interests without regard to the national picture as a whole. As I have said many times, the question is not so much the merits of some one program, but rather its relative merits. It is not whether a program has any value, but rather what its value is in relation to all the other programs. It is easy to spend, but it is difficult to economize. I sincerely urge that in our consideration of this, and the other appropriation bills that will be reported, that the Members will not look at it as just another bill but that they will try to view each bill and each item in relation to the budget as a whole. It must be borne in mind that \$100,000 for this item or that may in itself appear of no consequence, considering the billions spent each year by the Federal Government, but the national budget contains hundreds of items, and when one adds a little here and a little there, which has a certain appeal, when the end result is reached we have spent many millions that could have been saved.

I should like to say, before concluding, a special word with respect to the provision in this bill which denies the use of the money appropriated to pay the salary of any person who is a member of a labor organization the officers of which do not file affidavits to the effect that he is not a member of, or affiliated with, the Communist Party. Inasmuch as organizations of Government employees are generally not subject to the Taft-Hartley Act, these organization officers have not filed such affidavits as required by that act. The provision in this bill simply requires that they meet that requirement, as every other organization under the Taft-Hartley Act is required to do.

It does not seem to me that there should be any objection whatever to this provision, and I am confident that it will be welcome by the rank and file of Government employees who belong to labor organizations. There is no place in the Government for anyone who does not believe in our system of government, and I cannot see where anyone who works for the Federal Government, or who is connected with any organization of Government employees, should even for a moment hesitate to swear that he is not a Communist. The provision in this bill is part of our efforts to drive the Communists out of the Federal service and

to drive them out of the labor unions. This provision helps the average working man as the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act has served to help the average working man.

As to be expected, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] has directed his attack to the provision in this bill which would have the effect of ousting from the labor union of the Federal employees all officials who are Communists. In making this attack, he has followed the usual party line. He speaks glibly of freedom and the Constitution of the United States.

The gentleman advances the argument that this provision is unconstitutional, but he offers no settled principle of law in substantiation. It is a well-settled rule of constitutional law that when Congress confers an unusual right or privilege or benefit, it can stipulate what requirements must be met to enjoy such privileges or benefits. And that is precisely the principle we have followed under the Taft-Hartley Act and the provision of this bill. We are simply saying that if a labor union is to enjoy the protection and advantages of the Taft-Hartley law, the officials of the union must first file an affidavit that they are not Communists. In this bill we are saying that if the employees of a labor union are to enjoy the high privilege of working for the Federal Government, they must first require the officials of their labor union to file such affidavits.

The gentleman has stated that this provision in the bill brands employees as disloyal solely because of membership in a labor organization. The provision brands no one as disloyal. It denies no one the right to belong to a labor organization. It simply requires that a Federal employee divorce himself from affiliation with Communists who hide behind the Constitution while at the same time work to destroy it. The Federal employee may belong to a labor organization, but he may not belong to a labor organization that is ruled by Communists and at the same time work for the Federal Government.

The question is very simple and there should be no doubt as to the constitutionality of this provision. It surely is not too much to ask that the Federal employees take the same steps for ridding their organization of communism as is required of other labor organizations. No one who believes in America and is loyal to America should for a moment object to swearing under oath to his loyalty. Anyone who does object certainly should have no place on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ISACSON].

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, today is April 29, 1948.

There are 17 days left to May 15.

Seventeen days left before the combined armies of Transjordan and Egypt and the other Arab states burst their

way into Palestine as a devastating pestilence.

Seventeen days left of life for the 600,000 Jews of Palestine before they are wiped out in the most horrible of all pogroms.

Seventeen days left of life for us in this country. For if the Jews in Palestine die, we die with them.

Our honor dies.

Our hopes for peace on earth die.

Our spiritual essence—our very souls die.

There is no longer the time for pleading.

There is no longer the time for petition, for entreaty, for supplication.

There is no longer the time for words.

Only the most immediate action can yet prevent this tragic slaughter.

I am, therefore, today moving to discharge the Committee on Foreign Affairs from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 343, which provides:

First. The Government of the United States shall give wholehearted support to the partition decision, and the representatives of the United States in the Security Council shall immediately propose and support all measures designed to implement this decision speedily and effectively, including the establishment of an international United Nations police force and the arming of local militia in Jewish Palestine for self-protection;

Second. The President of the United States shall amend the Executive order declaring an embargo on arms shipments to the near eastern countries so as to permit shipments of arms for the self-protection of Jewish Palestine; and

Third. The Government of the United States shall call upon Great Britain, which is currently the beneficiary of great economic and military aid from the United States, to end its noncooperation with and sabotage of the Palestine-partition decision.

May I urge that the Members of this House cast aside political differences and unite behind this expression of the legislative branch of our great Government so that the executive branch may yet return to the path of partition, the path of justice, honor, and peace—justice for the Jewish people of Palestine; honor for the word of the American Government; and peace for the peoples of all the nations of the world.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I am appalled at the cut in the appropriation recommended for the United States Employment Service and the unemployment compensation programs. It is impossible from the report of the Committee to arrive at any accurate conclusion as to which functions are intended to be annihilated because of the tortuous bookkeeping that has been

employed. Certain areas of activity, specifically the Veterans' Employment Service and the Farm Placement Service have been exempted from any cut. This has been done with a disregard of the fact that these services are an integral part of the total Employment Service activity and are in a large measure dependent upon the maintenance of a high level of performance of functions not specifically included in the budget requests made for these two services. In other words, it is impossible to render an effective service to veterans and to the workers and employers in the field of agriculture if you emasculate the rest of the program upon which these services depend.

At the present time the country is confronted with one of the most difficult manpower needs for scheduled increased production. The European recovery program has committed a significant part of our facilities and manpower resources. To this must be added significant expansion in military production and the manpower needs for handling 9,000,000 more acres of agricultural production than were harvested last year.

The public employment service is the only Nation-wide agency we have that is specifically responsible for dealing with our manifold employment problems. It is of vital importance, not only in connection with European recovery commitments but to the rebuilding of our national security through accelerated aircraft production, ship building, and other necessary military production. Only through the employment service can we facilitate the movement of workers to the plants that are engaged in vitally important production without disrupting other important nonmilitary production. We cannot be certain that the budget request which was presented to the Congress if granted in full would be adequate to meet the obligations that these recent developments have placed upon the public employment service system. The cut in the budget here proposed, without any increase in the work load that is now being placed upon the employment service would seriously impair the rendering of the service that is needed.

It would be difficult to estimate the damage that will be wrought or to enumerate the different segments of the Service now furnished that will be annihilated.

When we come to the section on appropriations for grants to the States we encounter confusion. Worse than that, we encounter a repudiation of the position recently taken by both Houses of Congress which have declared that special emphasis should be given to positive action of securing jobs for workers rather than keeping them on unemployment-compensation benefits. And yet the committee report provides for an appropriation of \$65,000,000 to meet the administrative costs of paying unemployment-compensation benefits and only \$58,000,000 for the positive functions of finding suitable employment for workers in the labor force.

It was pointed out in the hearings of the subcommittee that the States estimated to maintain the Service without any impairment would require \$85,000,000. The increase in the cost of living and salary adjustments necessary to keep the Employment Service salaries in the States in line with other salaries paid to State employees accounted for the largest portion of this increase in cost. And yet, the administration requested only \$72,000,000 for grants to States in hopes that some of the increased salary costs could be absorbed through more economical and efficient State administration. In the face of these facts, however, the committee comes along and makes another \$14,000,000 cut in the amount to be granted to the States.

Let us face the facts squarely, whatever the politics involved in such a recommendation. It certainly does not constitute economy. We all know this will show up on the books as a net saving but we must realize that this alleged saving will be offset many times in the increased amounts of benefits being paid to unemployed workers because the Public Employment Service will be reduced to a point where it is unable to promptly find employment for such workers even though suitable employment opportunities may be available. Of course, the amount paid out of the State trust fund for unemployment-compensation benefits never shows up in an appropriation measure.

The recommendations of the committee should be rejected and the full amount of the request for these Services restored.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 11 minutes, to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if it be true that consistency is a virtue of small minds, and if inconsistency should be a characteristic of great minds, then I would have to congratulate the gentlemen who are handling this appropriation bill, H. R. 6355, and responsible for the construction of pages 7 and 8, on possessing the most gigantic and overpowered intellects it has ever been my privilege to encounter.

Not only are we asked to legislate on a matter of the greatest importance—the location of the United States Employment Service—as a casual incident in appropriating funds for that Service and for certain activities of the Federal Security Agency, but we are at the same time asked to repudiate and tear up the recommendation of the majority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department, that we freeze in our tracks and do nothing about reorganization until the Hoover commission shall have made its report next January on the operation of the executive department.

I extend my sympathy to the gentleman from Michigan who is the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. He and other members of the committee were helpless only a few weeks ago and giving us reasons why we should not approve the

President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would have transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the United States Department of Labor where it would have been coordinated with the United States Employment Service. In effect, the burden of their argument was this: Let us not do anything about reorganization until Herbert Hoover comes up with the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

I quote from the majority report disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, which this House approved and endorsed on February 25, when it voted to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1:

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1948 SHOULD NOT BE ADOPTED AT THIS TIME

Whatever may be the merits of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, this is not the time for its adoption.

Public Law 162, Eightieth Congress, first session, approved July 7, 1947, established a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. That act created a Commission composed of 12 members. Four were appointed by the President, four by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Two of the members of the Commission came from the executive branch, two from the Senate, two from the House of Representatives. An equal number were appointed from private life.

The present membership of that Commission is as follows: Herbert Hoover, Chairman; Dean C. Acheson, Vice Chairman; James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; Arthur S. Flemming, Civil Service Commission; George H. Mead, Dayton, Ohio; George D. Aiken, Senator from Vermont; John L. McClellan, Senator from Arkansas; James K. Pollock, Ann Arbor, Mich.; Joseph P. Kennedy, Hyannis Port, Mass.; Clarence J. Brown, Representative from Ohio; Carter Manasco, Representative from Alabama; James H. Rowe, Washington, D. C.; Francis P. Brasseur, Washington, D. C., Secretary to the Commission; Lawrence Richey, Washington, D. C., special assistant to the Chairman.

The Commission is required to make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress within 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized.

To enable the Commission to "study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government, to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act" the Congress in the first instance appropriated, for its use, \$750,000.

The ability and the character of the membership of the Commission, and the funds available to it, should be and are a guaranty that it can and it will present to the Eighty-first Congress an over-all plan designed to give economy by (1) limiting expenditures, (2) eliminating duplication and overlapping, (3) consolidating services, activities, and functions, (4) abolishing unnecessary services, activities, and functions, and (5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities, without impairing the efficiency of public service.

Because the Department of Labor was created to and must, of necessity, be an advocate of labor, and because a nonpartisan commission, on which the public, the executive departments, and the legislative departments are adequately and competently represented, is now engaged in spending almost a million dollars in a study involving the same subject

outlined in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1948, that plan should be rejected. The Congress should await the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Chairman; GEORGE H. BENDER; ROBERT F. RICH; HENRY J. LATHAM; JAMES W. WADSWORTH; FOREST A. HARNES; CLARENCE J. BROWN; ROSS RIZLEY; J. EDGAR CHENOWETH; FRED E. BUSBEY; MELVIN C. SNYDER; J. CALES BOGGS; R. WALTER RIEHLMAN; RALPH HARVEY; J. FRANK WILSON.

Now let me quote the clear and unmistakable words of the gentleman from Michigan who is the chairman of the Committee on Executive Expenditures, made February 25, and appearing on page 1708 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Congress created a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. . . . the Commission, as you will note, is nonpartisan and it would be difficult to find a group more competent and unbiased. The Congress gave that Commission which will report shortly after the next Congress convenes, \$750,000 for a study of the National Government. . . . so to me it seems a little absurd to suggest at this time that we should have piecemeal reorganization plans for the executive department. . . . It is also true that the adoption of piecemeal organization might well interfere with an over-all coordinated plan of organization. If we adopt this or other suggested reorganization plan. . . . we may in the end after the Commission's report is in find ourselves disposed to scrap these plans and adopt the plans recommended by the Commission. It seems no more than the use of common sense to suggest that we wait and get the results of this expenditure of what may be from \$750,000 to \$1,750,000 by a nonpartisan, fully qualified Commission made up of men who have had experience along the lines of reorganization.

If the gentleman from Michigan now votes for this transfer, I warn that he is running the risk of having his former peerless leader, Herbert Hoover, run out on him and make him look as foolish as he feared the Congress would look if it went ahead with Reorganization Plan No. 1 while the great engineer was bending his mighty brain to his study of the operations of the executive branch.

Let me read the counsel of caution, delay, and inaction given on the same occasion by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SNYDER], also a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

The reason I think we should pass the resolution—

To kill Reorganization Plan No. 1—

before the committee is because last year this Congress provided for the appointment of a Commission and provided funds for the use of that Commission in making a comprehensive and complete study of the organization of the executive branches of the Government, with the object of recommending to Congress improvements, the consolidation of functions, and the elimination of duplication. That Commission is now in the midst of its work and is to report to the Congress by next January. The Commission, no doubt, will make a study and include in its recommendations the same matter as is contained in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. It seems to me that it is wisdom to delay our action until we have a report from this Commission.

According to the statement of Secretary Schwellenbach, the present set-up is functioning in a satisfactory manner and there

is no immediate need of disturbing the existing set-up until we receive a report from the Commission.

Further, laboring what was then obvious to the majority of the committee, and which today seems to be conveniently forgotten, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] had this to say:

We have already appropriated \$750,000 for the Hoover commission to make an over-all study of the executive branch. It will include, of course, this particular question. Inasmuch as the committee is divided, it seemed to us on the committee that the sensible procedure is to wait until next January, at which time we will have before us the findings of the Commission, composed of very able and distinguished students of government. No harm will be done in the next 10 months by failure to transfer these two agencies now to the Department of Labor; therefore, it seems to me the part of wisdom is to vote for the pending concurrent resolution and to take no action upon any controversial reorganization plan until we have the report of ex-President Hoover and his commission.

Mr. Chairman, the Members who signed that report now have to eat their words if they vote for the provision of this H. R. 6355 arbitrarily transferring the United States Employment Service from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency.

Let me read the final sentence of their report again:

The Congress should await the report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

If the House now votes for the recommended transfer, it is at the same time bypassing the Hoover commission which was so highly recommended by the majority report on Reorganization Plan No. 1. We will be saying in effect that the Commission which, to quote the majority report, "is now engaged in spending almost a million dollars in studying the same subjects" shall today be ignored.

A vote for this transfer is a vote of no confidence in the recommendation of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department. It is a repudiation of that committee's recommendation.

It is a vote of disrespect to the Hoover commission, to which the Committee on Executive Expenditures, and later the majority of the House made many genuflections in the debate and vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1.

In view of the apparent readiness of the members of the majority of the Committee on Executive Expenditures to eat their empassioned words, I think we and the country, particularly the employers and wage earners who will be so greatly affected by the transfer, are entitled to wonder just how sincere the majority was in using the hallowed name of Herbert Hoover to defeat the proposal to locate both the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security which handles unemployment compensation matters at the Federal level in the United States Department of Labor, where it belongs. I think we are fairly entitled to conclude that the majority is willing to use any stick—even Herbert Hoover—to beat the dog with—the dog, in the majority view being

the Department of Labor that has been so systematically kicked around by the Republican Party.

This, I believe, is the true explanation of the inconsistency exhibited by the master minds of the Republican majority.

Before passing to the substantive issue, namely, the importance of this proposed transfer and its effects upon the welfare of wage earners and service to employers, may I, Mr. Chairman, briefly pay my respects to the well-oiled efficiency of the machine that is operating here today. We who are about to be chewed up in that machinery, along with the United States Employment Service and the wage earners of the Nation, may at least be allowed to admire the thoroughness and speed with which the machine is doing its work.

It will make interesting and instructive material for use in the coming political campaign.

Let me recapitulate: At high noon on April 27, yesterday, the House Appropriations Committee unveiled H. R. 6355 and the accompanying report proposing to strip the already stripped-down Labor Department of its largest remaining action agency, the United States Employment Service.

A few hours later the House Rules Committee met and, in a twinkling of an eye, granted H. R. 6355 a rule waiving all points of order, thereby armor-plating the bill against objections that it carries substantive legislation in an appropriation measure, thereby flagrantly violating due process in legislation, we are today being asked to vote on this proposal without hearings, without due consideration, without having afforded interested agencies and parties an opportunity to appear for or against the proposal. This, Mr. Chairman, is not a fair trial; it borders on the procedure of a well-conducted lynching party, in which the verdict has been written before the proceedings begin.

Also on the afternoon of April 27, the House Rules Committee obtained permission to have until last midnight to file its report on H. R. 6355.

The Rules Committee report, the report of the House Appropriations Committee, and the bill itself are before us today for the first time and I would be surprised if anyone other than the gentleman from Wisconsin who is in charge of the proceedings for the majority knows everything that is contained in these documents.

The majority machine has also arranged for H. R. 6355 to be taken up today immediately after the oleo decision, perhaps because it thought that the ways would be better greased for smooth and speedy passage.

I have a feeling, Mr. Chairman, that there is such a thing as being just too clever, too smart, too efficient. The machine rule such as is being exerted here on this bill is going to be recognized and resented by the American people, just as it has been recognized, resented, and broken up in times past.

The intent to do a job on the employment service, on the Department of Labor, on wage earners and on employers who rely upon the services of the Employment Service and the Bureau of

Employment Security is pretty well spelled out, I think, by the committee's recommendation with respect to the appropriation for the United States Employment Service for 1949. The committee would cut by 20 percent the amounts to be granted to States for the operation of State employment service other than for farm placement and veteran's placement activities. The committee would make a 30-percent cut in joint administrative expenses of the Employment Service and unemployment compensation.

Any effort to achieve economy is laudable, but reductions of this magnitude can mean only that such economy can be achieved at the expense of eliminating essential activities below the needs for serving our national economy and national-defense programs. There must be no reduction in the one facility which the country has to properly mobilize manpower for our national-defense program. In periods of high employment such as we presently have, the problem of mobilizing additional manpower is much more difficult and costly to operate. We cannot at this time afford to slash the appropriation for Employment Service activities. In fact, there should be no reduction in facilities of the employment service in the light of a 40-percent cut of actual operating expenses of last year, and in light of developing international conditions, and in the light of production commitments we have already made in the promotion of world peace.

Mr. Chairman, let me warn the House that we are running through warning lights that have been plainly set up. On April 9, the Council of Economic Advisers in its quarterly report, had the following to say about the need for an expanded and improved United States Employment Service to meet the manpower needs that are bearing down upon us:

The number of men involved in the contemplated increase in the armed forces and in the expanded industrial operations incident thereto will not exceed the expected increase in the labor force in 1948. The labor market is tight, however, and the frictional difficulties in the way of any accurate distribution of labor will lead to many local shortages. These can be minimized by making better use of the United States Employment Service.

To this end, we believe that the national office of the United States Employment Service would have to be enlarged and strengthened. The Employment Service should undertake to develop a smoothly functioning program of (a) priority referral in local offices, and (b) comprehensive interarea recruitment.

We of the minority are going to see to it that those who vote for this transfer of the United States Employment Service and for these reckless cuts in funds for that Service and for other functions of the Federal Security Agency will have to live with and defend that vote in the months and years to come.

A vote for this transfer and these cuts is a vote for confusion, for inefficient spending of public funds, for depriving both wage earners and employers of a vital service, for putting obstacles in the way of our manpower needs for maximum production to meet our ECA-ERP

commitments and the increased defense requirements and productions that are now plainly in sight. Speaking deliberately and after full consideration, Mr. Chairman, I say that a vote for the transfer and these cuts are a vote against the national welfare; and considering the crisis that is upon us, it is a vote against the national security.

So that the record may be made and so that we may all have a chance to stand up and be counted on this very grave issue, I now offer an amendment to strike out from H. R. 6355 the proposed transfer of the USES to the Federal Security Agency. This amendment I now send to the desk with the request that we proceed to a roll-call vote thereon.

Well, I do not know how to characterize that, but to characterize it as inconsistency is to express myself in a mild and most tolerant manner. I will confine myself to being mild and tolerant on this occasion.

I wonder how the Members feel with the knowledge that only 6 weeks ago or thereabouts they went up the hill and voted against reorganization during this session, and now my friend from Wisconsin is asking them to go down the hill and vote for a reorganization involving the very two agencies that you acted upon before, with the exception that in the President's plan they were organized into the Department of Labor and under this plan they are consolidated into Federal Security.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. With pleasure to my friend to explain his inconsistency.

Mr. KEEFE. Would the gentleman like me to explain what he conceives to be an inconsistency?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman could not do that.

Mr. KEEFE. All right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman this very simple question: The gentleman has spoken about the profound and convincing argument that was made. Did that argument influence the gentleman, and did he vote for or against the President's reorganization plan?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts said that that argument was made and was one that Members might well consider as a proper argument.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman voted for it, did he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. What is that?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman voted for the President's reorganization plan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I did. But one thing is certain, the gentleman is not consistent. The gentleman voted against Reorganization Plan No. 1. The gentleman voted against reorganization. The argument was made in the report of the majority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that no organization should take place before the report of the Hoover Commission. That is the substance of it at any rate. Now, my friend from Wisconsin, with all of the autocracy of the Appropriations Committee, because my friend is a mild, tolerant gentleman, comes in

and takes away not only the first jurisdiction of the proper standing committee of the House, but he is against the very argument made by his own members of the Committee on Expenditures.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In making this great research that the gentleman is evidencing on this subject did he happen to run across the speech which I made on the President's program? If he did, he will see that I urged exactly the same thing that I am submitting to the Congress today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the gentleman vote for President Truman's reorganization plan?

Mr. KEEFE. I did not.

Mr. McCORMACK. No; of course not.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course I did not, and I have been consistent all the way through.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is very sensitive.

Mr. KEEFE. No; I am not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is the easiest man in the world to get his sensitiveness aroused.

Mr. KEEFE. No. I am in charge of this bill and I take all of the darts the gentleman can throw and I laugh and smile at them.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman is going to do a cold-blooded job, sit down and do not try to explain it away. You cannot explain away the fact that the Committee on Expenditures recommended to the Republican-controlled House that President Truman's reorganization plan should not go through, that we should wait until ex-President Hoover's commission has made its report. The gentleman from Wisconsin is violating that and brings in a reorganization in an appropriations bill. Is there any question about that?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is the Democratic whip of this House, is he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it is fair for the gentleman to assume that I am the Democratic whip, and I was formerly majority leader.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman should not say a lot of things that he does not believe in himself.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Wisconsin has a most unhappy faculty, which is easily detected, of accusing every other Member, when his feelings are disturbed, of being guilty of the very things he is guilty of himself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendments to restore the cuts made in the appropriations for the United States

Employment Service and the Social Security Administration.

The bill reported out by the committee will emasculate the social-security program. It is part and parcel of the program of the Republican high command to scuttle every progressive piece of social legislation designed to help the little fellow.

There are two ways to emasculate legislation. The Republicans are trying both ways at the same time.

The first way is to amend, repeal, and undermine the legislation directly. House Joint Resolution 296, reported out by the Republican majority of the Ways and Means Committee which the Republican majority in this House passed on February 27 and sent to the Senate will exclude some 500,000 to 750,000 persons from social-security protection. This bill backed by the Republicans will mean the loss of insurance protection for thousands of persons. It will mean that many persons who have already paid their insurance premiums will lose insurance coverage. This is the Republican plan for social security—to exclude more people from the protection of the law. For those who want to know more about this outright brazen attack by the Republicans on our social-security law I refer them to the article by Thomas L. Stokes in his syndicated article on House Joint Resolution 296 which appeared on March 24 in the Washington Daily News.

Here is what Mr. Stokes said:

The joint resolution sponsored by Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, Republican, of California, is designed to circumvent and nullify a Supreme Court decision of nearly a year ago which interpreted the Social Security Act so that coverage would be extended to many persons hitherto classified as independent contractors and not eligible.

The joint resolution is the result of agitation and pressure from interests that would have to pay social-security taxes under the Supreme Court decision, including insurance companies and sweat-shop operators who contract out homework of various sorts. They got busy to exempt themselves from the decision.

This puts the Republican House leadership in a strange position. In its 1944 platform it pledged extension of existing old-age insurance and unemployment insurance systems to all employees not already covered. It has done nothing thus far to keep this pledge but by this measure, to the contrary, it tries to deprive those rightfully entitled to coverage, mostly persons in the white-collar class who do not have the protection of labor unions.

The second way the Republicans are trying to emasculate social security is through the appropriation bill we are considering here today. Last year they cut social-security appropriations. This year they are cutting even deeper. This year they are trying to cut the heart out of the program.

Now everyone here today knows that you cannot administer a law effectively unless you have the money and personnel to do the job right. Social security is a big business. The Social Security Administration administers the largest insurance business in the world. The benefits paid out for old-age and survivors insurance next year will be over \$600,000,000; the Federal grants for unemployment insurance and public assistance

over \$900,000,000. These two items total \$1,500,000,000. In addition the Social Security Administration supervises another \$1,500,000,000 being expended by the States for unemployment insurance and public assistance—a grand total of \$3,000,000,000. Yet the bill reported out by the committee cuts the research funds in Social Security from \$229,000 to \$100,000, or over 55 percent. The bill cuts \$129,000 in this item. Yet everyone knows that you need research and statistics to help improve the present program—to work out ways and means to cover more people, and improve the law in other ways. Every single person here at some time or other has asked for information and statistics from the Social Security Administration. Yet the appropriation bill cuts this function in half. The result will be less information and help to us and to the people of the country; less knowledge, less light on the need for improving the social-security law, less help to the aged, the blind, to widows, orphans, and the disabled.

That is the effect of this Republican-sponsored bill. That is the intent and the result.

What the committee report appears to say on page 26 is that the changes to be anticipated in the social-security program are of such a limited character that no real issues or questions for study are going to arise. That is a dangerous point of view—and, I trust, a mistaken assumption. Our social-security program is well-established, in the sense that it represents a good beginning. But it is not a completed program. Congress should long before this have given serious consideration to expanding the coverage of old-age and survivors' insurance, to adding disability benefits, to improving the basis for Federal financial aid in public assistance, and to many other improvements in the program. I refuse to believe that we are going to continue much longer the shameful neglect of the welfare of millions of our citizens which our failure to take action on social security represents.

The Social Security Administration has assembled facts and made studies which support recommendations for expansion and improvement of the program. But surely no one believes that when Congress turns seriously to study the program, it will not have a multitude of new questions to be answered, alternative proposals which must be analyzed and evaluated, new demands for information. Directly or indirectly we will turn to the Social Security Administration for much of that information. If the committee bill is adopted, Members of Congress will have only themselves to thank when they find that the information and the assistance they call for cannot be provided.

The Bureau of Research and Statistics has today only 50 employees, including clerical and administrative as well as professional staff. The committee bill would provide for a total staff of about 20. The present staff is hardly large enough to do more than keep up with the most pressing current demands for statistical information. It can only do that in fields where it can draw on

past studies and previous research. Any agency which has no margin to do basic and developmental research on new and emerging problems is headed toward senility. We cannot afford to have the Social Security Administration thinking about the social-security problems of today and tomorrow in terms of the facts and ideas of last year.

While Congress has turned its attention away from social security, labor and management have been struggling with problems of security for workers and their families outside the social-security system. Much of the pressure for employee benefit plans in collective bargaining results from the inadequacies of our social-security program. I suspect, however, that employee-benefit plans to supplement social security are here to stay. What rules the Congress should lay down for such plans—and what should be the relation of such plans to the basic social-security program are policy questions of increasing significance. We have a right to expect the Social Security Administration to make the studies necessary to any intelligent discussion of these questions. As a result of the budget cuts of last year, the Bureau of Research and Statistics was obliged to abandon plans for systematic studies that would have provided some information merely on the number of employee benefit plans now in existence and the types of provisions which are most commonly found in them. The Bureau has made a few case studies of individual plans, but that is all the present staff can do. And I am talking about the present staff, not about the Bureau's resources after the more than 50-percent cut imposed by this bill.

Another problem about which we, the Congress, should be demanding more rather than less information and study is improvements in the method of financing social-security programs, particularly the problem of additional Federal financial aid for the low-income States. Certainly the Social Security Administration has done research on this problem in the past, but the circumstances of 1948 and 1949 are not the circumstances of 1939 and 1940. Until we have solved the problem of making it possible for all States to provide adequate assistance to needy persons, I want to know that research and study has not stopped.

You cannot find out the answers to these and many other questions without having some people to study the problem. Every businessman knows the value of spending sufficient sums on research to improve his product, or reduce costs. Why should not the United States Government be willing to do the same thing?

The bill also cuts the informational work of the Social Security Administration by 70 percent. This cut means that the people who pay into social security will not be able to get a prompt reply to their letters. It will mean the public will get less and less information on their rights to benefits. It means that many insurance beneficiaries—widows, orphans, and dependent parents—will lose millions of dollars in benefits because there will not be an adequate informational service to tell them about their rights.

The appropriation bill cuts the appropriations for the Commissioner for Social Security in total about 20 percent. Then it transfers about another 75 percent out of his immediate control. The result is to leave the Commissioner for Social Security with only about 5 or 6 percent of the amount of money he has today. The result is a stab in the back of social security. It makes it almost impossible to run an efficient and coordinated social-security program.

The Republican record on social security is clear.

And, although they have been in power nearly 2 years, they have only produced three pieces of legislation of social security:

First. They froze the social-security contributions last year.

Second. They excluded adult news vendors from the social-security program a few days ago.

Third. They recently passed a bill in the House, House Joint Resolution 296, to exclude 500,000 to 750,000 people from social security.

This is the Republican record on social security. Now they want to add a fourth item to their list—the scuttling of the appropriations.

Everyone who votes today to support the bill as reported out by the gentleman from Wisconsin is voting against true social security. A vote for the bill is a vote against social security. A vote to restore the cuts is a vote for social security.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the proposed appropriation for the Children's Bureau shows a cut of about \$139,000 below the budget estimate. It is claimed that this cut will materially affect essential work for children especially in respect to health problems, and other serious physical impediments, and that it will cut down on funds for travel, essential if the Children's Bureau is to do its job, and for essential research.

Under leave to extend my remarks obtained in the House this morning, there follows a statement analyzing the details of these points by the American Parents Committee, a membership non-profit public service association working for better conditions for children locally and nationally, the chairman of which is Mr. George J. Hecht, of New York, publisher of the Parents' magazine:

THE AMERICAN PARENTS COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.
Memorandum to J. K. JAVITS, Member of Congress.
From American Parents Committee.
Re proposed 1949 appropriation for United States Children's Bureau.

The proposed appropriation for the United States Children's Bureau, part of the Federal Security Agency, is only \$1,385,000. This is \$69,265 less than the present year's appropriation, which, in turn, was less than the previous year's.

This appropriation does not include the maternal and child health and welfare grants in aid to the States, which the Children's Bureau administers under the Social Security Act, and for which sums are fixed in law.

Also rejected was the Bureau's request for an additional \$96,000 needed to administer and supervise more effectively the child

health and welfare grants to the States, and which would have restored some services lopped off by last year's budget cut in both field and departmental offices of the Bureau.

The Children's Bureau is the only Federal agency that is developing new programs for children with rheumatic fever, cerebral palsy, hearing defects, and other crippling conditions. The need for an adequate budget is obvious when you consider that heart afflictions due to rheumatic fever kill five times as many children of school age as infantile paralysis, whooping cough, diphtheria, scarlet fever, measles, and meningitis combined. Programs for the care of rheumatic-fever patients is only one of the Bureau's vital functions that will be affected by this appropriation cut.

Also turned down was a requested \$41,000 restoration of traveling expenses for the Bureau's staff, which sum was removed from the appropriation this year and is sorely needed because the Bureau has only 8 regional offices to serve 52 States and Territories. This year for example, the Denver regional office, serving six Rocky Mountain States, has only one medical consultant and one medical social worker. With such limited staff to cover such an area surely necessitates adequate travel expense.

Although the Appropriations Committee in its report states that it desires the Bureau's over-all appropriation to be held "to approximately the current-year level," by denying funds for necessary within-grade salary advancements, which therefore must be met from other funds, the committee has obliged a contraction of the Bureau's services.

The proposed 1949 appropriation turns down the Bureau's request for \$51,000, which would have provided a national clearing house for research in child life. This would have meant a service to scientists unobtainable elsewhere in the country that has long been requested by the Bureau by top-ranking authorities in this field.

The Children's Bureau budget is far too small in any case. This is most obvious when you compare it with other programs of the Federal Government that are spending many times as much on behalf of the health and welfare of cattle and hogs than it does on children.

GEORGE J. HECHT,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if, as it appears, the reduction in the appropriation for the Commissioner for Social Security from \$3,131,165 to \$221,000 suggests the dismemberment of the presently unified social-security program, I am unalterably opposed to it. This proposal raises a basic question as to whether we are going to have a coordinated and balanced development of social security in this country or whether each of the programs under social security will operate with little regard for the needs of the others.

This is the appropriation which provides funds for the Office of the Commissioner for Social Security and covers activities which are common to all four of the social-security programs: Old-age and survivors insurance, public assistance, unemployment compensation, and the health and welfare programs of the Children's Bureau. These activities were organized along present lines to assure

coordination in the administration of the present social-security programs and in the development of new ones as well as to avoid duplication and unnecessary expense. It would be a great mistake to go along with the crippling of this office through the elimination of its component service and control offices which enabled it to function effectively. In addition to the Commissioner's immediate office, this appropriation provides funds for such necessary and continuing activities as the review of the work plans, objectives, and accomplishments of the four program bureaus, the analysis of various proposals for financing social security, the evaluation of proposals for changes in the social security system and in addition for assuring that adequate factual information is made available to employer, employees, and the public regarding the rights and obligations under social security. Unless this latter function is performed adequately the administrative costs of administering the programs are greatly increased through inaccurate reporting of wages by employers, through increased difficulty in the adjudication of claims, and through the issuance of duplicate account number cards which are lost by employees through careless handling. The total of \$221,000 provided for all of the activities encompassed by the Commissioner's office is entirely inadequate. Since it is so obvious that these functions must continue so long as there is social-security legislation to be administered. I ask reconsideration of the proposal.

MAJOR FEATURES OF 1949 APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR THE SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION (H. R. 6355, H. REPT. NO. 1821)

This bill makes such drastic cuts in the Federal administrative funds for social-security administration as to undermine the effectiveness of the present social-security program and the possibility of its expansion as recommended in the 1944 platforms of both Democratic and Republican Parties. The over-all cut amounts to \$78,335,000 in a program whose administrative budget was relatively small in any case.¹

The most serious cuts and their implications are summarized as follows:

The Commissioner's office was cut as follows:

Budget estimate.....	\$3,131,165
Committee recommendation.....	221,000

Reduction, 93 percent.....	2,910,165
----------------------------	-----------

When the Social Security Board was abolished under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1946, all its functions were centered in the office of the Commissioner of Social Security (Mr. Arthur Altmeyer). Obviously his office is the nerve center of the program insofar as over-all direction of the program is concerned, and particularly with respect to policy and planning functions. This has the effect of eliminating many of these functions and throwing others back to the Bureau level, thus eliminating the possibility of any coordinated approach to the problem of human need and any real integration of function.

Informational service cut:

Budget estimate.....	\$109,997
Committee recommendation.....	30,000

Reduction.....	79,997
----------------	--------

¹ The total cost in 1948 of the Federal administration of the three social-security programs is 1.8 percent of the total benefit payments.

Informational service is an integral part of program operation in social security since it is essential that people be informed of their rights under the program and how to secure them. Already there are many complaints that people lose the benefit rights to which they are entitled by their own contribution because of failure to make application at the right time.

Bureau of Research and Statistics:

Budget estimate.....	\$229,830
Committee recommendation.....	100,000

Reduction.....	129,830
----------------	---------

This reduction is most serious in its implications for future development of the social-security program, since it means that the administration cannot carry on the technical work of research which must precede and accompany any changes in policy and program. Members of Congress and its committees are themselves largely dependent on this Bureau for the factual material on which their own decisions are based. Social security is a highly technical field involving complicated relationships between contributions, benefit payments, wage levels, Federal-State fiscal problems for which specialized research is absolutely basic.

Employment service and unemployment compensation:

Combined budget recommendation for grants to States.....	\$145,650,000
Combined committee recommendation.....	123,000,000

Reduction.....	22,650,000
----------------	------------

Combined administrative budget.....	6,398,671
Combined committee recommendation.....	5,312,000

Reduction.....	1,086,671
----------------	-----------

The House voted against the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 to combine these two functions in the Labor Department. Now the House Appropriations Committee recommends their combination in a new Bureau of Employment Security outside the Social Security Administration with a drastically reduced budget as indicated above.

ELIZABETH WICKENDEN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and that it be open to amendment at any point thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 5, line 12, strike out "\$123,000,000" and insert "\$145,650,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the original budget request for the United States Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Commission was \$145,650,000. This is the largest single reduction in the entire bill. It is a reduction of \$22,650,000, coming at a time when I know that a majority of the committee realized that we have the highest employment in the country, and at the same time we have the highest turn-over of labor in the history of the country. The needed request for an in-

crease over the budget last year is due mainly to the increased responsibilities that they have because Congress has given them the increased responsibilities and because of the salary raises that have been granted in practically all the States in the past year. Now, that is something that we cannot do much about. Here we say on one hand that we want a good, strong United States Employment Service; we want to make sure that the farmers in the Midwest and the South and the far West are taken care of by this farm placement service, and we specify particularly in the bill and the report that the \$400,000 set aside for farm placement service is not to be touched one cent.

At the same time this \$22,000,000 will have to be absorbed without any of that percentage being taken away from the Farm Placement Service.

It is all right to say that we want a strong Employment Service, but you are attempting to do in this appropriation just what you did to the Office of Price Administration. I heard so many times that some form of price control was needed, but what happened in the Appropriations Committee? They came here year after year with reduced budgets in an effort to make it unworkable, and they succeeded, until some parts of the OPA became the laughing stock of the country. One of the main reasons they did become the laughing stock of the country was the action of the Appropriations Committee in not giving them the necessary money to work with. The same thing can happen here. These people who are responsible for the administration of these two necessary divisions of government come in with their budget requests and justify their requests. Then who are we to say they can get along with \$22,650,000 less?

Mr. Chairman, my amendment just restores the original budget amount requested by the USES and the Unemployment Compensation Commission.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island would increase the amount provided in this bill for the combined UC and Employment Office services by approximately \$23,000,000. I tried to explain to the Members of the House, whether successfully or not I do not know, that the very saving the gentleman seeks to put back into this bill is made possible by virtue of the reorganization program this bill accomplishes. If his amendment were to be adopted it would just throw a monkey wrench into the whole reorganization program and would be giving them so much money they just simply would not know what to do with it.

As a matter of fact, under the program we have in mind this is what would happen. They have one State budget with one fund allocated to the States. If they run short of funds on the UC side then they can use the funds and personnel from the employment side. If the case load of Employment Service goes up and the unemployment goes down, it can use the unemployment compensation group over in the Employment Service, thus

having fluidity of operation which is not present today.

The director of the Arkansas administration spoke to me just a few moments ago. He has a deficit in his UC funds but he has a surplus in the Employment Service funds that were allocated to them. As things stand, he has to come up here and ask for a deficiency for his UC funds when he has plenty of funds over on the other side in the Employment Services that he could use if he were given the opportunity to do so.

We have provided complete flexibility in the utilization of these funds and the services under this bill. If you vote this amendment you are just completely destroying everything the committee has sought to do to provide some economy and some flexibility in the operations of this great system.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the President has failed to act. The reason is obvious. Eighty-one thousand CIO strikers who have partially tied up 50 meat-packing plants throughout the Nation are still committing flagrant acts of violence. They battle in large numbers with the police in Chicago. One striker seeking to stop a truck loses his life. One policeman was shot in Chicago and others injured. A general free-for-all battle between the police and hundreds of strikers in Kansas City is reported in the press.

Farmers who have to hold and feed grain to cattle, hogs, and livestock longer than necessary are losing millions of dollars. Millions of bushels of grain wasted in feeding livestock ready for the market which cannot be shipped because of the strikes.

The American Federation of Labor working in the same plants accepted the company's offer for a 9-cent raise. The radical leaders of the CIO, doubtless many of them Communists or fellow travelers, in the same plants have been carrying on this strike for over a month.

Under the Taft-Hartley law the President sent his fact-finding committee to investigate. They reported back to the President weeks ago in substance that the wage increase offered by the packers was sufficient for a settlement of the strike. Had the President then asked the Attorney General to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act by requesting an injunction, the strike would have been settled within 24 hours. The President, in failing to act, has encouraged the CIO officials to continue the strike.

The big packers in Chicago have been called to Washington this week by officials of the National Labor Relations Board in an effort to effect a settlement. Of course, this delay and the calling of

these packers into Washington must be carrying out the policy of the President.

It is interesting to observe that the CIO political officials throughout the Nation are the shock-troop leaders in support of the President for reelection.

Can it be that instead of vigorously enforcing the Taft-Hartley Act in the interest of all the people of the Nation that he is influenced not to do so by reason of political consideration?

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, on page 27 of the committee report, which deals with salaries for the Office of the Federal Security Administrator, the statement is made that the recommended reduction includes \$74,000 for the executive assistants in each of the 11 regional offices, which the committee believes could very well be dispensed with.

Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be familiar with all of the executive assistants in the 11 regional offices, but I do happen to be familiar with the situation in San Francisco. May I say that if there were a deliberately planned attempt to wreck the efficiency of that office it could not be put into effect in a more efficient manner than by this provision, because the executive assistant out there is one of the most competent persons I know in the whole Government service. Her appointment was in no sense political. As a matter of fact, she was in this office long before I came to the Congress the first time. I happen to know that she carries a major share of the responsibility for the administration of that regional office on her shoulders and has made a most creditable record.

I regret extremely to see this provision in the bill, Mr. Chairman, and I hope it will be stricken out by the vote of the House.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask a question which I think will be answered to my entire satisfaction by the chairman of the subcommittee. As will be recalled, it has been my purpose to inquire as to each appropriation bill whether there are any funds available for the purpose of installing new oil-burner equipment or to convert from coal to oil in Government installations. It may seem inappropriate to raise this question at the present time of the year, but I want to quote from a memorandum I received this week from a well-qualified source:

Although the petroleum supply and demand has shown improvement in the past weeks, we are by no means out of the woods. It is possible that the Nation will experience gasoline shortage this summer, particularly in the Middle West. Moreover, local shortages of fuel oils may again plague the eastern seaboard and the North Central States next winter. Supply and demand are so nearly equal that the nature of future events depends almost entirely upon a number of factors not susceptible of precise evaluation at this time—the weather, labor disturbances, the availability of steel, military requirements, disasters such as Texas City, the extent of increases in demand, and, of great importance, the degree of public conservation.

Having that in mind, I was not able to find any indication whatever in the terms

of the bill itself or in the committee report that the committee intends that one cent of these funds should be used for either of those two purposes. However, I thought it might be helpful, if the chairman agrees with that interpretation of the bill and report, to have him say so at this stage of the debate.

Mr. KEEFE. I may say to the gentleman that a reading of the report and the bill itself clearly indicates that there are no expenditures provided in this bill for any of the purposes he is talking about. I daresay that the bill carries funds to pay for all the old-age and survivors' insurance. If you are going to restrict the beneficiaries of old-age and survivors' insurance against the purchase of oil burners, it may be that the gentleman would want to put some limitation in this bill, I do not know, but, so far as this bill is concerned and so far as I know, there is not a dollar, a dime, or a penny involved in it for any of the purposes that the gentleman has been fighting for so long and so well.

Mr. HESELTON. I thank the gentleman. My principal interest is that the Government in its buildings, either owned or leased, should understand that under no stretch of imagination or construction can undertake new installations of oil-burner equipment or convert from coal to oil-burning equipment. The statement made by the chairman makes that crystal clear.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY:

On page 17, line 5, after the word "violence", strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, down to and including "1947" on line 9.

Strike out all of lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, down to and including "1947" on line 23.

On page 18, line 5, after the word "violence", strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, down to and including "1947" on line 9.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this strikes out the language that was added as a last-minute measure in the mark-up of this bill. I think, as everyone knows, that it was directed at one labor organization that has Government employees in its organization. When this was first suggested to me, when we were about to adjourn our mark-up that day on this bill, I did not know just what to do about it because of its various implications, and I said at that time that I would vote against the committee in marking up this particular item in the bill. When this report of the subcommittee was before the full committee a few days ago I told the full committee at that time that I was against it, and there was still some doubt in my mind as to whether it was decent legislation or not.

I am convinced, after giving it considerable thought, that it is very bad legislation on an appropriation bill. We did not hold any hearings at all on this item of the bill. There was no witness called one way or the other. It was just a directive that was given to the subcommittee the last minute and told to add or tack on to this bill, and that is how we got it.

Now, this goes a lot further than just to get the leaders of the UPWA Union. It affects every union that has to do with Government employees. Why it even goes so far as this, and I would like to

just give a personal explanation now. I have been a union man since 1930. I am paying now \$48 a year dues in the union that I belong to. If I did not come back to Congress next year and got a job in some agency of our Government this legislation would force me to give up 18 years of paying dues into my international labor organization or quit my own job that I have in that particular department. Is there anything fair about that?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. May I inquire what union the gentleman belongs to?

Mr. FOGARTY. The Bricklayers International Union.

Mr. KEEFE. Have the officers of that union signed the affidavit?

Mr. FOGARTY. They have.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, then, the gentleman would not be bothered at all. It would not injure the gentleman at all. The gentleman used a very bad illustration.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am just giving that as an illustration of what could happen. Take the typographical union, or maybe some one who may have been a coal miner back 25 years ago and holds a dues-carrying card in the coal miners union. If he has a job in the Government today he has to give up his union or his job; there is no question about that. But, take the union I belong to, if they had not signed the affidavit, I would be affected by it. That means I would have to give up 18 years of annual dues that I have paid in at the rate of \$48 a year. We have sick benefits that our families rely on. We have death benefits that we have been paying into for years. Is that a fair way to treat someone in a case like that? Going maybe a step further, what would happen if the Government took over the coal mines in this country, when the leaders of the coal miners union have not signed this affidavit? What would happen then? Who do you think would dig the coal if legislation like this is tacked onto an appropriation bill?

No; it goes much further than what has been maintained here this afternoon. I hope the amendment will be carried because of the unjust provisions to so many people that we do not know anything about, who will be affected by the provision. We did not have any information before the committee or in the record as to how many people in the Government employ would be affected by such a situation as I have explained to you. In order to be fair to them, if not to anybody else, I hope the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Was not this amendment thoroughly discussed by the members of the subcommittee?

Mr. KEEFE. It was.

Mr. CHURCH. We considered it and talked about it often.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say that utter candor and frankness compels me to say that I have no pride of authorship of the proposal in this bill. Certain CIO unions have sent telegrams to Members of Congress asking them to vote down the Keefe rider simply because I happen to be chairman of the committee. This provision in the bill, which we thoroughly analyzed, is a sound provision, in line exactly with the provisions that have been carried in appropriation bills for a number of years.

I call the attention of the Members to the fact that nothing that is done in this life can be done with complete finality. I recall that I learned when I was a student in law school that there were some 386 hypotheses that could be indulged in in the drafting of a will. After 30 years of the practice of law, I have found I would be sitting there for the rest of my life drawing one will if I listened to all the conceivable situations that you might possibly think of and conceive of in human relations that just do not exist.

The gentleman has told about his situation. He was a member of the bricklayers' union before he came to Congress. He used that example unfortunately because it is not a good illustration at all. The officers of the bricklayers' union have signed the non-Communist affidavit. Nothing in this provision would affect his situation at all. There may be a situation, however, where such a question might arise. I am willing to concede that. I am willing to concede that you might find one or two isolated cases in the Government service where perhaps somebody had been a member of a union the officers of which had refused to comply, for reasons best known to themselves, with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. I am satisfied that if such a situation does develop—and I make this statement on the floor of the House now—I would be perfectly willing in connection with the discussion of this matter in the conference with the other body to see to it that if there is any such reasonable possibility as that, although we have not been able to find it in our discussions of the provision, there might be some other language included that would take care of just exactly that situation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question with regard to my position. I have been a member of the typographical union since 1913. I have been an active dues-paying member. If what the gentleman from Rhode Island says is true, I might have to resign from Congress or surrender my card in the typographical union, and I propose to do no such thing.

Mr. KEEFE. I would not ask the gentleman to do that, and there is nothing in this asking you to resign your seat in Congress—not at all. That is just typical of the flimsy arguments that are being made. I cannot yield further to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, because he is not making any worth-while contribution to our thought on this subject. The

gentleman does not understand apparently what is in the bill.

Mr. DINGELL. I am trying to.

Mr. KEEFE. I am telling you that there is nothing here that would affect you at all. You are not an employee of the Government.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman understand one thing—that the typographical union president and the officers of the International Typographical Union have not taken the pledge. They have not signed non-Communist affidavits.

Mr. KEEFE. They have not signed the non-Communist affidavits as required.

Mr. DINGELL. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. They have not signed the non-Communist affidavits as required by the Taft-Hartley law. Do you know the reason why they have not signed them, principally those who are affected in the Government Printing Office? I will tell you why—

Mr. DINGELL. Because they are not Communists.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. Let us make this clear. The reason these Government unions have not signed the affidavits according to the Taft-Hartley law is that they are not required to do so. They do not use the services of the NLRB, and they do not use the Mediation Conciliation Service. Their salaries are fixed by the Congress. That is all there is to the situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. The fact of the matter is that we have talked with some of the officers of these other Government unions, and they are perfectly willing to sign such an affidavit. It comes in pretty poor conscience, it seems to me, for a man who is the head of a union like the International Typographical Union to say, "I am no Communist. I despise communism. I will not have anything to do with them, and I will not have one in my organization, but I refuse to sign this particular affidavit." I am just as certain as I am standing here that you will not run into any such difficulty at all. But what this will do is to say to Mr. Abraham Flaxner and his associates running this organization, which is absolutely Communist-dominated, that is the UPWA, "Either fish or cut bait." That is all there is to it, because there are plenty of good organizations of Government workers in this country who are perfectly willing to sign a non-Communist affidavit. It seems to me the time has come when we say to these people, "It is true that you are making your contribution to support Flaxner and his crowd out of the pay that the Government gives you. Now it is up to you, Mr. Government Employee, to say to Mr. Flaxner and to Miss Nelson, 'We are not going to contribute

funds to you Communists to carry on your activities.' That is all there is to this situation and you can raise all these other bug-a-boos from morning till night. That is all there really is in this situation. That is what it is intended to strike at.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. The chairman of the committee says that is the only thing in it. He knows that is not so. He knows, as you yourself know, that if you carry a card, if you take a Government job, you have to give up your card or give up your job. There is no question about it.

Mr. DINGELL. If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will indulge me a moment, I will be glad to yield to him later.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman from Wisconsin realizes that the way we operate on the House side, so far as the Committee on Appropriations is concerned, gives very little opportunity for any of us to come before the committee and find out much of what is happening. As a matter of fact, you have such a closed corporation that members of one of your own subcommittees cannot very well barge in on another subcommittee. Your own members are barred from taking part. Therefore, frequently one hand does not know what the other hand has been doing. I have a right, as a Member of Congress here in the Committee of the Whole, to ask questions and to determine for myself what course to follow. That is all I am trying to do.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield right at that point? I want the gentleman to ask questions and I want to give him the information.

Mr. DINGELL. You were loath to answer the questions when I tried to clarify the fact that because the president of the International Typographical Union did not sign the non-Communist affidavit, my position either as a Member of Congress or a member of the typographical union was at stake.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman think he would, under these circumstances?

Mr. DINGELL. Well, suppose you engineered such a thing as I was led to believe by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] had occurred in the committee, do you not think I have a right to know, and if such a condition did exist would I not have a right to vote against a pernicious action of that kind?

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Did the gentleman charge and put words into the mouth of the gentleman from Rhode Island, that something pernicious and iniquitous did occur in the committee?

Mr. DINGELL. I would say it would be iniquitous and pernicious and worse than that if what he said was correct.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, what do you charge him with saying?

Mr. DINGELL. I am not charging him with anything. He said that my

standing as a member of the typographical union was at stake in what you accomplished in the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. What did he say?

Mr. DINGELL. Did you not hear him say so?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think he said any such thing. I think you are putting words in his mouth.

Mr. DINGELL. I am not trying to put any words into his mouth. I am trying to put his words into your head. I have listened to your lectures here on the floor altogether too long.

Mr. KEEFE. You have not listened to very many.

Mr. DINGELL. I never got anything out of them. As far as the membership of this House is concerned and as far as the membership of the typographical union is concerned, they are no more Communists than the gentleman from Wisconsin, and they should be protected in their rights as citizens of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I understand the provisions of this clause in question. If I am in error, I hope the chairman of the committee or someone will correct me.

If I read this provision right, it says in substance that if a Government employee belongs to a union and the officers of that union do not comply with the requirements of section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, that that person will be penalized by losing his job because of what somebody else does or, rather, fails to do.

Now, suppose that a man, a member of a union involved, were begging his officer to sign and he would not sign. Suppose half of them in the union were doing it, or even 95 percent were doing it, and suppose everybody knew the officer involved was not a Communist, but just a stubborn man, and suppose that, being a stubborn man, he stood on what he claimed was his American rights, and for that reason just refused to sign the required affidavit. To penalize all of these men because they belonged to that union and could not force this man to sign the affidavit in question is, to my mind, going far afield from our duties here. You know there is such a thing as our doing a serious injustice under the cloak of patriotism. I think all of us love this country. I know that I do.

I take it that all of us want this Government to prosper and to be protected, but I take it also that all of us want to be fair to individuals and not to penalize people for something they cannot help. That is what we would be doing if this provision is left in the bill. It clearly is unfair as it stands, and this provision in question, is, in my judgment, also unconstitutional.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman spoke about there being just a few. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. CHURCH. Does the gentleman believe that if this provision of the bill is adopted, and if Mr. Flaxner remains in his position as head of his union—and he is considered a Communist—if he continues there, does not the gentleman believe the employees would insist on his getting out? He is even less than a "few."

Mr. MORRIS. That is right. The gentleman has asked me a question. I will try to answer it. I do not know who the gentleman is talking about. I have never received any telegram—

Mr. CHURCH. I am talking about Flaxner.

Mr. MORRIS. I do not know anything about Flaxner. I have received telegrams from no one. I have no information on the matter except my own study of it. All I am doing is just standing up here as a Congressman and an American citizen trying to be fair to people generally and help make fair laws.

Mr. CHURCH. If the gentleman—

Mr. MORRIS. Now, wait! Let me speak for just a minute and I will try to answer the gentleman's question, and the gentleman has raised a very intelligent question, one that bears on the debate.

It takes time to remove a person from office, and the person might come in with a mandamus suit, injunction or other court action to prevent his removal from an office in the union. It might be 6 months' time or a year, it might even be several years before they could get him out, and the innocent Government employee's family would starve or at least suffer while they were trying to get him out.

I say that guilt is a personal thing. You cannot make me guilty because of something you did; that is not American, that is not right. If somebody fails to follow the law or if somebody else is guilty, that corruption of blood should not be worked upon my head; and if I am guilty you should not be called guilty because I am. That is all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman has given a very fair explanation of just what can happen in this legislation and how far it can go; but it goes a lot further than that. We have one or two Members of Congress who at one time in their younger days worked in coal mines and who still carry a card. Is it not fair to assume that there are other men who worked in coal mines who have Government positions today and who still hold cards in the miners' union? This legislation would parcel them out even though they had been paying into the union for 15 or 25 years.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly it would have that effect, there is no question about that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to hear the gentleman make this explanation of this particular section of the bill. He presents the point very clearly that this is the old principle of guilt by association.

Mr. MORRIS. That is right.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. A principle which was outlawed at Runnymede when they made King John sign the Magna Carta.

Mr. MORRIS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. In answer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCAN-
TONIO], a few minutes ago, I tried to simplify this question. The issue is simply this: the Federal employee may belong to a labor union, but he may not belong to a labor organization that is ruled by Communists and at the same time work for the Federal Government.

The gentleman from Oklahoma mentioned the time element awhile ago, that it might take 6 months or such under present law to do certain things, but this bill will shorten the time within which we can get rid of the Flaxners and other Communists who are giving trouble to our loyal American workers today.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

In getting rid of communism, let us do it the right way, let us do it the American way, let us do it the fair way. Let us not trespass on the rights of innocent people in doing it. It is not necessary.

I want it distinctly understood that I do not impugn the motives of the chairman of the subcommittee; I do not impugn the motives of any man here. I think you gentlemen are trying to do what is right. I am not saying you are willfully doing anything wrong. I do not mean that at all. I have respect for your committee, and I will go along with you gentlemen when I think you are right. But I am saying to you that I am going to oppose you or anybody else in the Halls of this Congress who I think is deviating from the true path that I believe ought to be followed. I am going to fight for the protection of the liberties and just rights of the people of the United States to the very best of my ability.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is intended to get rid of the Communists and the "pinks" who are employees of the Federal Government, a movement which is long overdue. There is no use getting up any blood pressure about this situation because the Congress is ready to do it and it is ready to do it now. The motion of the gentleman from Rhode Island is not going to prevail. This House is not going to strike out that clause. So let us get down to some prac-

tical aspects of the situation because I see considerable merit in the suggestion of the gentleman from Rhode Island. I can see how we will unwittingly do some injustice if we adopt this language as it is.

As I understand the situation, a person might have been at some time a member of a labor organization and still hold a card and carry that card and be entitled to certain benefits out of the union, but at the same time he may be employed by the Government and in no way associated with the management of the union. Under this provision as I read it he would lose his Government job. That is not what we are intending to do at all. We do not intend to do an injustice to anybody, I am sure, by this provision.

Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion that I think will heal this situation. On page 17, line 5, where we refer to "an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or who is a member of any labor organization the officers of which have never complied," and so forth, I suggest that at the end of line 5, after "labor organization" we say "of Government employees." I think that will get at the root of what we are trying to do; that is, these labor organizations of the Federal Government that are affiliated with an organization which refuses to comply with the law. They must divorce themselves from that union that is subversive or they must suffer the penalty of separation from Government service.

There is an old saying down in the country where I come from that if you lie down with the dogs you are going to get up with fleas. If they want to associate with an organization that refuses to comply with the law, and it is "pink" or communistic, then let them get out of the Government service. If they are bona fide, good American citizens, and do not want to be associated with that organization, then they can divorce themselves from an organization that is subversive.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I will say to the distinguished gentleman that the committee has given that question very careful consideration, but I call the gentleman's attention to this fact that if we use the language which he has suggested, we are perhaps eliminating the very union that we seek to get out, because this Flaxner union, which has been condemned by the minority as well as the majority as being Communist led and inspired, is a union that covers not only Federal Government workers, but covers State employees, municipal employees, and county employees. Therefore, you see, if we exempt them and make it apply to Government employees, we would be letting them out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, if a local union of Federal employees wants to associate with that kind of company, and they want to keep themselves mixed up with Communists or subversives, or organizations of that character, then they must suffer the penalty.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if you simply use the language, "any labor organization of government employees" would not that cover a union that had State, local, and Federal employees? You would not have to say, "Federal Government."

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, if the gentleman will yield, we considered that very carefully and came to the conclusion that we were legislating for the Federal Government, and by implication and construction it would apply only to Federal employees.

Mr. GARY. How about "public employees?"

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; but this union has employees in the State, Federal locals, and everything else.

Mr. GARY. Suppose we use the words "public employees?"

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I would say to my friend, as I indicated in my statement on the floor, that I quite agree with what he has said. It is not entirely free from the possibility of some inequities that you might think of. But, the suggestion has been made, and I wonder what the gentleman from Virginia would think of this, that after the provision just as it is, this language were to be inserted:

Provided, That notwithstanding the provisions hereof an employee may continue his membership in any organization if the cancellation of such membership would result in loss of insurance or other like benefits, the rights to which existed prior to January 1, 1938.

Now, that would cover the situation and cover every case that has been talked about here and would not destroy the entire provisions of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is better than what we have. At the same time, I think we ought to be pretty careful to see that these folks that want to mix up with these Communist groups, get out.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, would the words "public employees" carry out the idea that the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I had reference solely to Federal employees.

Mr. GARY. Since this other question has arisen, if we make it "public employees" which would cover both Federal, State, and local employees, would not that take care of the situation and remove the objection which the committee has?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That would be agreeable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman from Wisconsin, I am very much concerned about the language employed to meet the objectives in mind. If the officers of the union to which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] belongs refused to sign the affidavit, and he was an employee of any agency of the Government, under this provision, unless he resigned from the union or joined some other union the officials of whom sign, he would lose his job. The same applies to any other employee.

The gentleman from Oklahoma made a powerful argument that under this provision, a Federal employee is found guilty and sentenced because of the action or nonaction of some other person. I remember an old saying that is pretty well embedded in Anglo-Saxon law, that it is far better that 99 guilty persons escape than that one innocent person suffer. That is one of the foundations of Anglo-Saxon law and our way of life. That is a way of describing the fundamentals in which we believe.

This provision is very far reaching, and it disturbs me very, very much. It seems to me that including the words "public employees" after the word "union" would enable the conferees to give it further consideration and it would confer on them broad jurisdiction when the matter goes to conference.

Further, if the gentleman from Wisconsin and the majority of the subcommittee had in mind a particular union to which Federal employees belonged, why could they not have written into the bill language relating to a member of the union who is a Federal employee, but who became a member of a union subsequent to becoming a Federal employee. Certainly, if a man is a member of a union for 25, 20, 15, or 10 years and then becomes an employee of the Federal Government, and desires to continue in the union, no matter what his reason is, sick benefits, or death benefits, or because of his love of and pride in his union, we should not by our action disturb him when he has not done anything himself.

To me, this is deep. I have fought communism. I am the author of the only real legislation aimed at communism, passed by Congress in years, the Foreign Agent Propaganda Act, the McCormack Act. My committee recommended making it a crime for any person knowingly or willfully to advocate the overthrow of the Government by force and violence. It took me 3 years to get that legislation through, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] ably helped me. My committee also recommended giving the Army and the Navy the power to control subversive activities in camp or aboard ship, a power that was sadly lacking before the special commit-

tee of which I was chairman years ago made our recommendations.

I have my opinion about this, but I do not want my constitutional rights invaded. I have to protect the other fellow's constitutional rights to protect my own. In this case, in order to get at a particular group we might jeopardize the rights that individuals possess under the Constitution, which we should do everything we can to preserve and protect. That is what concerns me. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will put in this provision the words "public employees." That phrase is broader than "Government employees." When the committee goes to conference, the members will then have something to work on, and it will remove from our minds the great doubt which so many of us honestly entertain. If this provision of the bill is passed the way it is at present, many Members, even while voting to retain it, will feel seriously disturbed that such a provision should pass the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, there are certain propositions that have been overlooked here in the debate on this amendment. The first is that the constitutionality of the provision requiring officers of unions to sign the so-called non-Communist affidavits has not been settled. That provision is now before the courts of the land. It is being tested there. Its constitutionality is being challenged on the basis of its violation of the first amendment. What if we adopt the language in this bill then the Supreme Court rules that that provision of the Taft-Hartley Act is unconstitutional? Where would this Congress be? That is one proposition.

The second constitutional proposition is that I do not see how you are going to escape the decision in United States against Lovett. I read from it during the general debate. Some of you were not here at that time, and I want to re-emphasize what this decision stated. It said, discussing one case particularly, the Cummings case, involving also the taking of an oath:

The oath required an applicant to affirm that he had never given aid or comfort to persons engaged in hostility to the United States and had never been a member of, or connected with, any order, society, or organization, inimical to the Government of the United States.

That was thrown out as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the United States. In referring to that decision, and a similar decision in another case, here is what the Supreme Court of the United States said in the Lovett-Dodd-Watson case. It said:

They stand for the proposition that legislative acts, no matter what their form, that apply either to named individuals—

As in the Lovett-Dodd-Watson case—and now get this—

or to easily ascertainable members of a group in such a way as to inflict punishment on them without a judicial trial are bills of attainder prohibited by the Constitution. Adherence to this principle requires invalidation of section 304.

That was the section we passed here in 1943, and the Court further says:

We, too, adhere to it.

Now to go one step further. I direct my remarks to the people who voted against the Taft-Hartley law. Labor leaders are challenging the non-Communist oath proposition on a strictly labor basis. John L. Lewis has not signed. Philip Murray has not signed, and many other prominent leaders of the labor movement who are by no stretch of the imagination members of the Communist Party have refused to sign that affidavit for very valid pro-labor reasons. They believe it their duty to refuse to sign those affidavits. They consider that section in the Taft-Hartley Act repugnant to the Bill of Rights and strictly anti-labor in character. I agree with their contention. For this added reason I support the amendment.

I now include herein a brief prepared by the United Public Workers, CIO:

UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF PROPOSED RIDER WITHHOLDING SALARIES FROM FEDERAL EMPLOYEES WHO ARE MEMBERS OF CERTAIN UNIONS

I

Preliminary statement

There has been proposed to the House Appropriations Committee that a rider be attached to various appropriation measures withholding salary payments to all employees who are members of a labor organization the officers of which have failed to submit to the affidavit filing requirements of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Appropriations Committee is being asked to initiate a drastic program in connection with the rights of Federal personnel without holding hearings, without airing the program in full, and without giving those affected by the proposed rider an adequate opportunity to present their viewpoint. Such a procedure is inherent in the practice of legislating through appropriations riders. The proposed rider, however, is more objectionable than any which has ever been submitted to the Appropriations Committee. There has never been a rider proposed for adoption by the Appropriations Committee, and, indeed, there has never been any legislative proposal so fundamentally in conflict with our constitutional guarantees and so totally subversive of the American way of life.

Nature and Scope of the Proposed Rider

The proposed rider is unconstitutional on its face. Here are a few of the injuries which the rider imposes upon Federal employees:

1. It destroys the constitutional right of freedom of association for the great mass of innocent hard-working Federal employees. It cuts off from the Federal pay roll, and, in effect, brands as disloyal, employees not on the basis of any disloyal act but solely because of membership in a labor organization.

2. It denies to Federal employees even a pretense of a hearing. The drastic stigma of disloyalty is to be attached to our Federal personnel without any hearing whatsoever. In thus denying a hearing, the proposed rider violates the constitutional guarantees of due process of law.

3. The proposed rider by forcing the Federal employee to choose between his job and his union destroys his free right to join a union, a right guaranteed by the Lloyd-La Follette Act, as well as his right to freedom of thought, a right guaranteed by the Constitution.

4. The proposed rider is not only unconstitutional but drastically amends or repeals

(a) the Lloyd-La Follette Act; (b) the Taft-Hartley Act.

II

1. The proposed rider destroys the constitutional right of freedom of association for the great mass of innocent, hard-working Federal employees.

If there is one principle which is fundamental to our democratic society it is that guilt is personal and may not be imputed because of an individual's membership in a particular group. This is especially true where, as here, the group involved is a labor organization, the formation of which is protected by the constitutional guaranty of freedom of association.

In cutting off from the pay roll individuals on the basis of membership in a labor organization the rider is in direct conflict with the Constitution as construed both by the Supreme Court and the Attorney General.

2. The proposed rider denies to Federal employees even a pretense of a hearing.

It should be borne in mind that the Federal employees who are adversely affected by the proposed rider are not even guaranteed a semblance of a hearing.

The President's loyalty order has been widely criticized because it denies a full hearing to Government employees charged with disloyalty. It has been pointed out that the lack of opportunity afforded by that order for full cross-examination and an opportunity to confront the accuser denies to the accused employee adequate procedural protection.

Under the proposed rider there are no safeguards whatsoever. An individual is afforded no hearing at all in order to give him an opportunity to defend his loyalty. His membership in a labor organization becomes the basis of a conclusive presumption that he is disloyal. There can be no question that such a denial of procedural protection to an employee violates the fundamental safeguards of our Constitution. The fact that the individual's loyalty is involved makes imperative his fully procedural protection. There can be no question that the result of the rider will be, in effect, to deny employment in the Federal Government because of alleged doubts as to an individual's loyalty. The consequences of the rider will be to deny an individual employment in his chosen vocation and to cast doubts upon his loyalty to his country. This is a penalty of a criminal character (see *U. S. v. Lovett* (323 U. S. 303)), and to deny an individual a hearing in the face of such serious consequences is to make a mockery of our Constitution.

Finally, it should be borne in mind that among the guaranties of the Lloyd-La Follette Act of August 24, 1912 (5 U. S. C. 652, 37 Stat. 555) is the requirement that every employee receives a written statement of the grounds of his dismissal and be afforded an opportunity to reply. The purpose of this statute was to prevent precisely what this proposed rider would do, namely, deny employees the right of freedom of expression, and to prevent arbitrary dismissals.

3. The proposed rider by forcing the Federal employee to choose between his job and his union destroys the free right of the Federal employee to join a union—a right guaranteed by the Lloyd-La Follette Act—as well as his right to freedom of thought—a right guaranteed by the Constitution.

The Lloyd-La Follette Act guarantees to Federal employees the right to join an employees' organization or union for the purpose of seeking betterment of conditions of employment and to petition Congress for the redress of grievances.

This statute was designed to lift from Federal employees the so-called gag rules which prescribed dismissal as a penalty for union activity and which converted Federal employees into second-class citizens. This act, which may be termed the "magna carta" of

the Federal employee, made it clear that Federal employees were to be placed on the same footing with all other American citizens (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5080), and to express the view of Congress that an American citizen when he enters the civil service should not by that act lose his right as an American citizen (48 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 5207).

This rider completely eliminates all of the protections of the Lloyd-La Follette Act. The right of a Federal employee to join a union is now to depend upon a strict form of political censorship under which a union is condemned by congressional fiat. Moreover, by imposing a political test upon Federal unions Congress has interfered with the rights of Federal employees to freedom of political expression in a manner which is plainly inconsistent with the Constitution. It is now well-established that Congress is subject to the limitations of the Constitution in dealing with Federal employees and that the American constitutional system as well as the requirements of the Lloyd-La Follette Act prevent treating Federal employees as second-class citizens. In addition, our entire civil-service system and years of bitter experience in evolving intelligent personnel practices have taught us that the most serious danger to the morale and effectiveness of the Federal establishment is arbitrary dismissal. This rider would elevate the arbitrary dismissal to a new standard of respectability and overnight destroy the protections of Federal employees so vital to an effective civil service.

4. The proposed rider is not only unconstitutional but drastically amends or repeals (a) the Lloyd-La Follette Act and (b) the Taft-Hartley Act.

The proposed rider makes a shambles of the Lloyd-La Follette Act with its protection of Federal employees' self-organization, of the right to a hearing as a protection against arbitrary dismissals and of the right to freedom of political expression.

In addition, the rider enlarges the scope of the Taft-Hartley Act. Under that act, labor organizations may not enjoy the benefits of Federal administrative machinery when their officers fail to submit to the filing requirements contained in the act.

These filing requirements are now under constitutional attack on the ground that they interfere with freedom of thought and freedom of assembly. A case involving this attack is now pending before the Supreme Court.

This proposed rider greatly enlarges the filing requirements so as to deny an individual employment because an officer of a labor organization which he belongs to has failed to comply with such requirements. This proposed rider can only be characterized as a "ripper" bill which is designed to force thousands of employees to abandon a union which they have freely chosen upon threat of economic sanctions.

If there is one principle which is established in our constitutional system, it is that congressional conceptions of trade-union or political orthodoxy may not be forced upon American citizens.

As the Supreme Court has ruled in *Board of Education v. Barnette* (319 U. S. 624):

"If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation, it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this shows the difficulty that is encountered whenever an honest effort is made to deal with this problem. The argument

is bitter, emotional, sometimes picayunish. We sometimes, too, forget the objective that we have in mind, and that is to remove from the control of labor organizations in the country those who are dedicated to the cause of communism. That is what this amendment proposes to do. Where did the opposition to this spearhead from? It spearheaded originally from that very union—Abraham Flaxner's and Eleanor Nelson's union. They are a constituent part of the CIO. So they enlist the sympathy of the parent organization and then the barrage of telegrams starts. It may be that you can conceive, as I said before, of some situation that might arise where an injustice might be done. But it is mighty strange to me that the president or any other officer of any great union would say to the members of his union, "I refuse to sign this non-Communist affidavit, and as a result you lose your job." That just is not going to be the case, and no Government worker is going to lose his job who ought not to lose his job—I can tell you that because there are plenty of organizations of workers that are officered by people who are Americans and all any person has to do—all any person has to do who belongs to Flaxner's organization is to resign and get out of that union and join one of the other unions that is officered by Americans. That is what we hope to accomplish.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 28, noes 108.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, after examining H. R. 6355, which proposes to transfer the United States Employment Service from the United States Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency, to cut its funds and to cut other FSA funds by from 20 percent to 30 percent on top of 40 percent cuts made last year, I have a feeling that the controlling majority in this House is writing legislative policy with an egg beater—not just one egg beater, but several egg beaters—and that the cakes that are going to come out of the oven for the American people will not be appetizing, edible, or digestible.

Too many cooks are using too many egg beaters to write contradictory policy, and this House, driven like a 20-mule team with blinders, is pulling the contradictory policies through to enactment and delivery to the American people.

I have confidence that the American people will quickly find out what has been done to their welfare and security in action such as we are about to take today with respect to H. R. 6355. When they do, I believe that such actions will be repudiated and reversed.

Mr. Chairman, I sat for days in the hearings conducted by the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on Reorganization Plan No. 1. Nothing human was alien to that hearing. We considered not only the

proposed transfer of the Bureau of Employment Security to the Department of Labor and its coordination with the United States Employment Service, but the details of the GSI strike and even the possibility of a 5-day week on dairy farms.

Over and over again we heard the arguments that there should be no reorganization until the sage of Palo Alto, Mr. Herbert Hoover, and his Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, had labored and brought forth, sometime next January 1949, a report and recommendations. Those who were opposed to Reorganization Plan No. 1, which would have put these two interrelated services together in the Department of Labor where they belong, clung for dear life to Mr. Hoover and his commission as an excuse for doing nothing.

This excuse became the theme song of the majority in its report to the House. The House adopted it.

Until noon Tuesday, April 27, when the Appropriations Committee threw it in the ash can, the stand-still agreement until the Hoover report was made had been the official majority policy.

Now we have a new policy, in direct conflict with the old policy. The gentleman from Wisconsin is writing this week's policy, superseding the previous policy, promulgated by the gentleman from Michigan.

I await with interest the formulation and unveiling of next week's policy. If the members of the majority do not run out of egg beaters, we may have a choice collection, including that fearful and wonderful reversal of the old "balance the budget and retire the national debt" policy that was imposed on the country when the recent tax cut was adopted in a fit of election-year jitters.

Mr. Chairman, in essence, this is simply another attack upon the United States Department of Labor and indirectly upon the welfare of the wage earners of this Nation. Labor knows what is happening, labor knew last year when the Labor Department budget was cut 40 percent. Labor knew last February and March, when we turned down the President's sensible Reorganization Plan No. 1. Labor recognizes this maneuver for what it is—class legislation against the wage earners at the same time that the Congress is appropriating substantial funds for adequate services to farmers and businessmen, provided those services are located in agencies other than the Department of Labor.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 17, line 5, after the word "organization", insert "of public employees."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the 5 minutes because I have already explained the purport of this amendment.

I think this amendment will in some degree help to avoid the injustices that have been suggested by the gentleman from Rhode Island, and the purpose of this amendment is so to arrange the situation that an organization of Federal employees who belong to a union whose

officers refuse to sign this affidavit of non-communism will either have to give up their Government job or divorce themselves from that union. That seems to be a pretty fair proposition from our standpoint. They can stay in the union if they want to but if they do they give up their Government job; or they can keep their Government job and divorce themselves from the union whose officers refuse to say that they do not belong to the Communist Party.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. In just a minute.

I have been studying the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Wisconsin, the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I am afraid that under that amendment which states that a person who has financial benefits coming from a union may still remain in the Government notwithstanding the fact that his officers refuse to sign the anti-Communist affidavit. It seems to me that the worst Communist in the country, if he had a card and had certain benefits coming to him could remain under that amendment a Federal employee; and that is not what you want and not what I want.

I do not say that this amendment is going to accomplish wholly the purpose and I am offering it in the hopes that it will be adopted and then the gentleman from Wisconsin, with whose purposes I am in full accord, can work something out in conference.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is it not a fact that under the gentleman's amendment the employees of the Government Printing Office who are members of the ITU, whose officers have not signed the affidavit, that those employees of the Government Printing Office would be compelled either to leave the job or disassociate themselves from their union?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is just exactly what I mean. I am here to defend the honest, straightforward, good American citizens who are in Government jobs; but I warn them to stop affiliating and associating with these Communists. I am saying to give them their option. If they want to associate with Communists, if they want to belong to an organization whose officers refuse to say that they will support the Constitution and laws of this country, then let them do so but get them out of the Government service. If they want to stay in the Government service let them get away from such a union.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad the gentleman sees fit to bring his amendment out into the public. The gentleman used the phrase "public employees." I believe the gentleman, unintentionally, of course, adds to confusion by his amendment. What is the meaning of the gentleman's phrase "public employees"? The gentleman brings his amendment here out into the public. The word

"public" is rather indefinite, broad, and confusing. The bill as it is written is clear.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. CHURCH. I am both asking the gentleman a question and trying to tell him, briefly, that I am afraid that his amendment confuses the situation. I do not believe the phrase, "public employees," is very clear.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Maybe the situation is confused, maybe the gentleman from Illinois is confused. I cannot judge which one is confused; perhaps we are all a little confused about this. I confess that I am not satisfied that my amendment is going to cure the situation but I think it will help, and I am sure that the gentleman from Wisconsin, if this amendment is adopted, will try in conference to work out language that will protect the Government and at the same time protect honest employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take the 5 minutes allotted to me but I wish to call the attention of the membership to this situation. I think the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and the gentleman who is now addressing you and the members of the Committee, have in mind the attainment of a single objective. The thing that has always brought about these things was the activities of certain individuals. Everyone here knows this fellow Flaxner and Nelson have communistic records a mile long and they are being supported in the carrying on of their communistic activities by the clique that is paid from the Government pay roll. We appropriate money for them.

But they go farther than that. They organize these GSI employees. I think there are perhaps two or three thousand of them. Now, those GSI employees, the workers in these cafeterias around town, are not Government employees, they are not public employees. Out over the country Flaxner has sucked into his union county employees, State employees, municipal employees, and a lot of employees that do not fall into any such category.

Mr. Chairman, if this is limited as suggested by the gentleman from Virginia in its application to membership in unions of public employees, you will immediately jump right square into the question: Is Flaxner's union a union of Government employees or not? Certainly the best you could say for it is that he has only a partial number of public employees. Only a small number of the employees of these unions fall in such a category.

I wish what the Congress would do is limit the language as the committee has written it in this bill after very long and serious consideration. Let us work this situation out in conference with the Senate when the bill goes to conference. I have already indicated on the floor of the House in response to questioning of the gentleman from Massachusetts and others that as chairman of this committee, and I know I bespeak the interest

and will of the subcommittee, I will see to it that in conference when we get to it every one of these situations will be taken into consideration and if we have failed to canvass all of them heretofore they will be canvassed, because we do not want to hurt a person who is in the position of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] or the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], or any other person who is a good American, yet through force of circumstances is a Government employee and is desirous of keeping his membership in a union, the officers of which have not seen fit to sign the non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley law.

I would prefer to have this language worked out in conference with the Senate rather than to take a chance on the haphazard inclusion of language here which, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia were adopted, would completely nullify the objective we have in mind, which is to get at Flaxner and his crowd.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee has said that our committee gave this long and serious consideration. The first I ever heard of it was when we had finished marking up the bill. I had never heard of it before. It has never been discussed except on that day. It was not discussed in the committee hearings that I attended. I do not blame him for getting a bit confused, but it is his own fault.

Here we have another example of the Appropriations Committee attempting to legislate, the same as we had in the forefront of the bill in combining the USES and turning it into the Federal Security Administration. In this instance we have another attempt by the Committee on Appropriations to take over the work of a proper legislative committee of this House. It is no wonder things are confused when you legislate in that way.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Virginia) there were—ayes 21, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 2, line 8, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,161,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this is the part of the bill that has to do with the dental health program that we are initiating this year. I think it is of such importance and of such benefit to the youth of this country that we should do everything we possibly can to see to it that the various organizations of parent-teachers throughout the country, and every other group affiliated with and working for the children of the country, should be given an opportunity of knowing just what this program is and to take the best advantage of it.

The inclusion of this \$161,000 is for publicity that the budget asked for,

something which I think is needed, and it is not asking too much of this Congress for such a worth-while program.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say this, that the language that the gentleman from Rhode Island has offered proposes to add about \$161,000 to the dental health program. It was not a budgeted item. It came up in an informal budget submitted by the Public Health Service at the request of the committee after the regular budget item was submitted.

I have already discussed this in general debate. The committee felt that we had treated this subject very, very fairly. If I had my own personal way I perhaps would have given more money than was given. The committee, however, in its judgment, worked out what the officers of the National Dental Association have declared to be a fine program. The very program that we worked out with 50 mobile units going throughout this country to set up this program in the States is the greatest publicity that could possibly be given to this program.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I took no time in general debate on this measure. At this point I should like to speak for a few minutes on this bill. I am heartily in favor of the pending amendment which is designed to accelerate the dental-health program among the youth of our country. After all, the amount of money requested is very small indeed, yet it should contribute tremendously to the health of the youth of the country and good health is one of our greatest national assets. This program is approved by the American Dental Association.

I think the subcommittee is due much credit for the exhaustive hearings which were conducted on the subject of mental health. Mental illness is costing this Nation hundreds of millions of dollars per year. Unfortunately however, the committee after conducting exhaustive hearings, reduced by \$500,000 funds requested for research and training in the field of mental illness. In my opinion this was short-sighted economy and I wish to express my disapproval of the action taken. The Nation is suffering greatly from its lack of information and research in the field of mental illness.

I must say that I am in hearty accord with the provision of the bill which seeks to outlaw communism. I also favor the provision of the bill which places the United States Employment Service in the Federal Security Agency.

I think some very worth-while economies have been achieved and I favor them.

Mr. Chairman, I should hate to see the social-security program crippled. The Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance is rapidly growing by reason of the large coverage among our citizens in all the States. I think the committee made a mistake in reducing funds which are necessary for the proper administration of the social-security program.

Reverting again to the pending amendment for the dental-health program, I wish to emphasize the importance of the program and urge passage of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendment thereto do now close.

Mr. FOGARTY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not press the motion, because if he does, I shall be compelled to make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I think some of the Members are entitled to a few minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman threaten to make the point of order that a quorum is not present?

Mr. SABATH. I said I would be obliged to if the gentleman insisted on his motion.

Mr. KEEFE. We have a quorum here.

Mr. SABATH. No; I do not think we have 100 Members here.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman want to talk on the bill?

Mr. SABATH. No.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman know of anybody else who does?

Mr. SABATH. There are two gentlemen who have amendments and they should not be foreclosed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point or order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-two Members are present, a quorum.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to move now to close debate?

Mr. KEEFE. I withdraw that motion, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have four amendments on the desk. They all pertain to the office of the Social Security Administrator. The amendments are all in single sums, but I ask unanimous consent that they may all be read, and I shall speak in general terms on them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FOGARTY:

On page 12, line 15, strike out "\$166,000" and insert "\$216,836."

On page 12, line 15, strike out "\$166,000" and insert "\$246,000."

On page 12, line 15, strike out "\$166,000" and insert "\$182,445."

On page 12, line 15, strike out "\$166,000" and insert "\$295,830."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, all of the amendments that have just been read pertain to cuts that have been made in the Office of the Social Security Administrator. I think everyone in this country today wants a good social-security program. Both parties are committed to it. It should be a nonpartisan effort by Congress to make sure that this program is made stronger rather than weaker, as this committee is doing in taking away necessary personnel the Social Security Administrator has at the present time. I think almost all of us agree that we want to extend social security into other fields. We all realize that the unions and industry now are entering into agreements on pensions and social-welfare funds throughout the country.

In all of these programs I have attempted to increase the appropriation for the Office of the Administrator. The Office of the Administrator asked for \$3,131,000. They transferred out of his office \$2,352,000, and left him the whole sum of \$221,000 to run one of the biggest business corporations in the world with not enough personnel to take care of it. The personnel and business manager part of it has been cut in half. The Coordinating and Procedures Division, one of the most essential divisions of the social-security program, has been completely eliminated by this committee. The Training Division, the smallest division in the Social Security Administration which only has an appropriation of \$16,400 and employing about four men to take care of an agency which employs 12,000 people, is being wiped out in its entirety.

The Publications and Review Division and Information Service were practically eliminated. Almost all of the service divisions in the social-security program have been eliminated. Whom does that affect and how does it affect them? I know that many Members of Congress get requests from women whose husbands have died who do not know what this set-up is all about. Sometimes they have to wait 2, 3, or 4 years before they start collecting the benefits for which their husbands have paid. Because of the elimination of services of this kind, we are denying persons benefits and service which we all say we want to guarantee to the people who are covered by the social-security program at the present time. The Bureau of Research and Statistics has been cut almost 60 percent. That is one of the most vital divisions in the entire social security set-up. I know the argument made by the majority of the committee was, "Why, this has been established for a long time. Why do we need any research facilities at all now?" Almost every Member of Congress goes to an office like this several times a year for information and statistics of the Social Security Administration. We are not giving them enough help to answer the inquiries they get from Congress in the next year in the administration of the social-security program as it has been reported by this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, all that I can say in answer to the argument

by the gentleman from Rhode Island is that it is unfortunate that he does not understand the situation. The Social Security Administration, of which Mr. Altmeyer is the head, administers the old-age and survivors' insurance program. We are giving them more money than they had last year to administer that great program which is a great part of the social-security set-up. I explained in my statement this morning what we had done. It comes with poor grace, it seems to me, to now argue in the face of a lack of information as to what the situation is in reality, that we are stripping the Social Security Administration of its ability to even answer a letter from a Member of Congress. The old-age and survivor's insurance program is not going to be touched at all. We have done away with a lot of surplus big money deadwood that is down there in the Social Security Administration that is carrying on a job that you do not want carried on. You may rest assured when you examine the break-down on page 23 of the report and the explanation that goes with it, that we have not acted blindly but we have acted in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendments were rejected.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Rhode Island offered four amendments to be considered en bloc, as I understood. Therefore, as I understand it, the vote just taken applies to the rejection of all four amendments. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The Committee has just voted on all four amendments.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 8, line 10, after the word "act" strike out the period and insert "and the sum of \$10,000 is hereby appropriated to be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the procurement and upkeep of barn pigeons to be domiciled in such quarters as may be vacated by agencies herein transferred from the Department of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture to be responsible for disposing of marketable pigeons in such manner as will not interfere with free enterprise operating in the normal channels of trade."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is not germane and not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California desire to be heard?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN [Mr. GRAHAM]. The Chair rules that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore not germane. The Chair sustains the point of order.

ANOTHER REPUBLICAN ATTACK ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is not merely an appropriation meas-

ure. It is really another in the series of Republican attempts in the Eightieth Congress to hamstring social security—the most far-reaching social legislation ever enacted in the history of this country. Regardless of the protestations to the contrary, the Republican record against social security is altogether too clear. As the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] recently pointed out on the floor of the House, the entire Republican membership of the Committee on Ways and Means in 1935, when this legislation was enacted by a Democratic Congress, filed a minority report protesting that the old-age and survivors' insurance titles of the act were unconstitutional and expressing doubt whether the unemployment-insurance provisions would result in a general national benefit at that time. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUSTSON], the present chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, filed supplemental views in which he contended that the social-security taxes would increase unemployment and retard recovery, and, Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, but the gentleman from Minnesota would have vested the program for economic security in the Veterans' Administration instead of establishing the Social Security Board.

Mr. Chairman, slowly the Republican opposition to social security declined to the point that in 1944 the party was pledged to extension of old-age and unemployment insurance to all employees not now covered. Yet, what is the record of the Republican Eightieth Congress? First, to take away the coverage of news vendors. Second, the House has voted to remove from social-security protection some three-quarters of a million workers and their families engaged in industrial home work and outside selling activities. Third, legislation to repeal sickness and maternity benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act is now pending on the House Calendar.

Of equal or greater significance is the action of the Appropriations Committee regarding the office of Commissioner for Social Security and the Bureau of Employment Security. The Bureau of Research and Statistics is at one and the same time the brain, the heart, and the nerve center of the social-security program. This office conducts the basic studies necessary to analyze the existing coverage of social security and the deficiencies or mistakes that may become apparent at operating levels. It supplies the committees of Congress with information upon which to legislate and to appraise the need for expansion of social-security coverage. To reduce this research staff from 50 to 20 employees can be justified only upon the assumption that a Republican Congress either is not going to enact any progressive social-security legislation or that they want to legislate in an uninformed vacuum.

I understand that the Division of Research and Statistics has been quite active in providing information to employers and unions on health and welfare funds. A reduction in appropriations from \$229,000 to \$100,000 will impair this service at a time when in the Detroit area this subject is one of the very live labor management issues. One unnecessary

strike over an employees' health and welfare fund that might have been avoided had objective actuarial information been supplied by the Division of Research and Statistics will cost many times over to the Government and to the country the amount of the saving effected by the Appropriations Committee.

The 70-percent reduction in the appropriations for Publications and Review Division and Information Service is equally unwise. Of what good is it to extract a social-security tax from employers and employees, only to have the workers and their dependents, the aged, and the orphans lose their right to benefits because they have not been informed as to the method of application for such benefits or even as to their eligibility for benefits. That would most certainly be the result if this reduction is approved.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this bill makes the very important mistake of removing from the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Social Security the activities of the Bureau of Employment Security. Unemployment insurance is an integral part of the social-security structure. Yet, effective coordination between the unemployment-insurance activities and the old-age and survivors' insurance program will be greatly handicapped by this action. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means I have carefully studied the objections of various State unemployment administrators to the supervision exercised by the Commissioner of Social Security, and I am frank to say that I believe the problem of unemployment is one that can be solved only at the national level and that it is imperative that we keep our entire social-security operational agencies as closely coordinated as possible. A certain amount of bureaucracy in the greatest insurance office in the world is to be expected, but we should not contribute to irresponsibility and inefficiency through bad legislation by an appropriation committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported the amendments to rectify the damage proposed by the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. HALLECK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6355) making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill. Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. In its present form, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, do not the rules of the House provide that the person offering a motion to recommit must be unqualifiedly opposed to the bill? Do they not provide that if there is a Member who is unqualifiedly opposed the Chair must give preference to such Member as against a Member who is qualifiedly opposed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Texas opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question properly is: Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MAHON. I am opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the bill H. R. 6355 be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 2, line 8, strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,100,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 272, nays 35, not voting 123, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—272

Abernethy	Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.
Allen, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio
Allen, La.	Beall	Bryson
Anderson	Beckworth	Buck
H. Carl	Bennett, Mich.	Buffett
Anderson, Calif.	Bishop	Bulwinkle
Andresen	Blackney	Burke
August H.	Boggs, La.	Burleson
Angell	Bolton	Butler
Arends	Bonner	Byrnes, Wis.
Arnold	Bradley	Camp
Auchincloss	Bramblett	Cannon
Banta	Brehm	Case, N. J.
Barrett	Brooks	Chadwick

Chapman	Holmes	Poage
Chelf	Horan	Potter
Chiperfield	Hull	Poulson
Church	Jenison	Preston
Clark	Jensen	Priest
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Ramey
Clevenger	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin
Coffin	Johnson, Tex.	Rayburn
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Ala.	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, N. C.	Reed, N. Y.
Combs	Jonkman	Rees
Cooley	Judd	Reeves
Cooper	Kean	Regan
Cotton	Kearns	Rich
Cox	Keating	Richards
Cravens	Kee	Riehlman
Crawford	Keefe	Riley
Crow	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Fla.
Cunningham	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Curtis	Kunkel	Rohrbough
Davis, Ga.	Landis	Rooney
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Ross
Davis, Wis.	Larcade	Russell
Dawson, Utah	Latham	Sadlak
Deane	Lea	St. George
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Sanborn
Dolliver	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Domenegeaux	Lewis	Sasser
Dondero	Lodge	Schwabe, Okla.
Doughton	Love	Scott, Hardie
Elliott	Lucas	Scribner
Ellis	Lusk	Seely-Brown
Ellsworth	Lyle	Shafer
Elsaesser	McConnell	Short
Elston	McCulloch	Simpson, Ill.
Engel, Mich.	McDonough	Smathers
Evins	McDowell	Smith, Kans.
Fellows	McGarvey	Smith, Va.
Fenton	McGregor	Smith, Wis.
Fernandez	McMahon	Snyder
Fisher	McMillan, S. C.	Spence
Flannagan	McMillen, Ill.	Stanley
Fletcher	Mack	Stefan
Folger	MacKinnon	Stevenson
Foote	Macy	Stigler
Fuller	Maloney	Stockman
Fulton	Martin, Iowa	Sundstrom
Gamble	Mathews	Taber
Gary	Morrow	Talle
Gathings	Meyer	Teague
Gavin	Michener	Thomas, Tex.
Gearhart	Miller, Conn.	Thompson
Gillie	Miller, Md.	Tibbott
Goff	Miller, Nebr.	Tollefson
Goodwin	Mills	Towe
Gore	Morrison	Trimble
Gossett	Morton	Twyman
Graham	Muhlenberg	Vail
Granger	Mundt	Vorys
Gregory	Murdock	Vursell
Gwynne, Iowa	Murray, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Hagen	Murray, Wis.	Walter
Hale	Nicholson	Welch
Hall	Nixon	Welch
Edwin Arthur	Nodar	Wheeler
Hall	Norblad	Whitaker
Leonard W.	O'Hara	Whitten
Halleck	O'Konski	Whittington
Hand	Owens	Wigglesworth
Hardy	Face	Williams
Harness, Ind.	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Harris	Patterson	Winstead
Harvey	Peden	Wolcott
Hays	Peterson	Wolverton
Hébert	Philbin	Wood
Heseltin	Phillips, Calif.	Woodruff
Hinshaw	Pickett	Worley
Hoeven	Plumley	Youngblood

NAYS—35

Blatnik	Holifield	McCormack
Buchanan	Huber	Madden
Carroll	Isacson	Mahon
Dawson, Ill.	Jackson, Wash.	Marcantonio
Delaney	Karsten, Mo.	Morris
Dingell	Kelley	O'Brien
Donohue	Kennedy	O'Toole
Feighan	King	Powell
Fogarty	Kirwan	Price, Ill.
Gordon	Klein	Sabath
Hart	Lane	Sadowski
Havener	Ludlow	

NOT VOTING—123

Abbitt	Boykin	Coudert
Albert	Brophy	Courtney
Allen, Ill.	Buckley	Crosser
Andrews, Ala.	Busbey	Dague
Andrews, N. Y.	Byrne, N. Y.	Devitt
Bakewell	Canfield	Dirksen
Barden	Carson	Dorn
Battle	Case, S. Dak.	Douglas
Bell	Celler	Durham
Bender	Chenoweth	Eaton
Bennett, Mo.	Clippinger	Eberharter
Bland	Cole, Mo.	Engle, Calif.
Bloom	Colmer	Fallon
Boggs, Del.	Corbett	Forand

Gallagher	Johnson, Okla.	Ploeser
Garmatz	Jones, Wash.	Potts
Gillette	Kearney	Price, Fla.
Gorski	Kefauver	Rains
Grant, Ala.	Keogh	Redden
Grant, Ind.	Kerr	Rivers
Griffiths	Kilburn	Rizley
Gross	Kilday	Robertson
Gwinn, N. Y.	Lemke	Rockwell
Harless, Ariz.	Lesinski	Schwabe, Mo.
Harrison	Lichtenwalter	Scoblick
Hartley	Lynch	Scott
Hedrick	McCowen	Hugh D., Jr.
Heffernan	Manasco	Sheppard
Hendricks	Mansfield	Sikes
Herter	Mason	Simpson, Pa.
Hess	Meade, Ky.	Smith, Maine
Hill	Meade, Md.	Smith, Ohio
Hobbs	Miller, Calif.	Somers
Hoffman	Mitchell	Stratton
Hope	Monroney	Taylor
Jackson, Calif.	Morgan	Thomas, N. J.
Jarman	Multer	Van Zandt
Javits	Norrell	Vinson
Jenkins, Ohio	Norton	West
Jenkins, Pa.	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Jennings	Pfeiffer	
Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Van Zandt with Mr. Eberharter.
 Mr. Allen of Illinois with Mr. Garmatz.
 Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Fallon.
 Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
 Mr. Canfield with Mr. Keogh.
 Mr. Cole of Missouri with Mr. Multer.
 Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mrs. Douglas.
 Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kefauver.
 Mr. Schwabe of Missouri with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Pfeiffer.
 Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Lesinski.
 Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Kilday.
 Mr. Eaton with Mr. Lynch.
 Mr. Griffiths with Mrs. Norton.
 Mr. Gwinn of New York with Mr. Morgan.
 Mr. McCowen with Mr. Price of Florida.
 Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Redden.
 Mr. Bender with Mr. Vinson.
 Mr. Brophy with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Dague with Mr. Battle.
 Mr. Coudert with Mr. Albert.
 Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Engle of California.
 Mr. Lichtenwalter with Mr. Dorn.
 Mr. Hess with Mr. Colmer.
 Mr. Carson with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Miller of California.
 Mr. Bennett of Missouri with Mr. Crosser.
 Mr. Busbey with Mr. Forand.
 Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
 Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Jarman.
 Mr. Gross with Mr. Harrison.
 Mr. Taylor with Mr. Abbott.
 Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Hedrick.
 Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Rains.
 Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Sikes.
 Mr. Gillette with Mr. Heffernan.
 Mr. Corbett with Mr. Gorski.
 Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Rivers.
 Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Hobbs.
 Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Fatman.
 Mr. Jennings with Mr. Monroney.
 Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Hendricks.
 Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Norrell.
 Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Manasco.
 Mr. Kearney with Mr. Somers.
 Mr. Rizley with Mr. Mansfield.
 Mr. Case of South Dakota with Mr. Boykin.
 Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.
 Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Durham.
 Mr. Devitt with Mr. West.

Mr. FOGARTY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DELANEY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DONOHUE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. LUDLOW changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAHON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Ansonia Evening Sentinel.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "Sacrifices on the Altar of the Oleo Trust."

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, extending an invitation to a very fine performance on the steps of the Capitol tomorrow morning.

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. BRADLEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Senator VANDENBERG.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a beautiful tribute to Mother.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a compilation of veterans' rights granted by laws of the State of North Carolina.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in order to pay tribute to the memory of the late President of the Philippine Islands, Manuel Roxas.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and insert certain quotations.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Archibald Alexander.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered in the city of Washington last evening by the Honorable Joe L. Blythe, of North Carolina.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks

in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein a brief on the constitutionality of certain language in the bill prepared for me by the United Public Workers of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. MARCANTONIO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances.

HOOR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS IN THE REGULAR ARMY, ETC.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker pro tempore be authorized to appoint two additional conferees on the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate thereof.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, which was read:

APRIL 29, 1948.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, I have received 11 subpoenas duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court on the 3d day of May 1948 at 10 o'clock a. m., as a witness in the case of the *United States v. Albert Malta* (No. 1354-47, criminal docket), and to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

Your attention and that of the House is respectfully invited to a resolution of the House adopted in the Forty-sixth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 680), upon the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

"Resolved, That no officer or employee of the House of Representatives has the right, either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpoena duces tecum, to produce any document, paper, or book belonging to the files of the House before any court or officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any

of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, before any court officer, nor to furnish any copy of any testimony given or paper filed in any investigation before the House or any of its committees, or of any paper belonging to the files of the House, except such as may be authorized by statute to be copied and such as the House itself may have made public, to be taken without the consent of the House first obtained."

And a resolution adopted by the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 1295), from which the following is quoted:

"Resolved, That by the privilege of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate or process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission.

"That when it appears by the order of a court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House."

These resolutions result from the issuance of subpoena duces tecum upon the Clerk of the House to produce certain original papers in the files of the House.

Permission to remove from their place of file or from the custody of the Clerk, any papers, was denied by the House, but court afforded facilities to make certain copies of papers to be secured from the House. This seems to be the uniform procedure in the case of subpoena duces tecum served upon the Clerk of the House of Representatives to produce original papers from the files of the House.

The subpoenas in question are herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of the motion picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion picture industry during the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed the motion picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, concerning the motion picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any person, groups, or individuals between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, concerning the motion picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators, H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same since October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members since October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1948: September 24-26, 1947, October 20-30, 1947, Hanns Eisler, Hollywood.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee since October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee since October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are alleged "subversive" or "un-American."

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities since October 20, 1947, which are alleged "subversive" or "un-American."

9. For the period since October 20, 1947, to date, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1938.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1 to October 20, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of

its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1 to October 20, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propa-

ganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to:

Author	Title	House Report No.	Congress	Session
Thomas.....	AYD.....	271	80th.....	1st.
Do.....	Communist Party.....	209	do.....	Do.
Do.....	The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power.....	592	80th.....	Do.
Do.....	Southern Conference.....	1115	do.....	Do.
Do.....	Civil Rights Congress.....			

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1947:

November 22, 1946 (revised 1947), Budenz.
February 6, 1947, Eisler.

Bills to outlaw CP March 24-28, 1947, April 9, 1947, Eugene Dennis.

July 7, 1947, Walter S. Steele.

February 27, July 23-25, 1947, Communism in Labor Unions.

July 22, 1947, Kravchenko.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from January 1, 1947, to October 20, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE UNITED STATES V. ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution," were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations hereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda * * * (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution."

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to:

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executive, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1945: Executive hearings that were released by the committee December 15, 1944. September 20, 1939-April 19, 1943. Volumes 1 through 7.

1946:

September 26-October 19, 1945, Communist Party.

June 20, 27, 1945, OPA.

January 30, 1945, G. L. K. Smith.

April 4, 1946, E. B. Jarg (JAFRC).

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are allegedly subversive or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, which are alleged subversive or un-American.

9. For the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Copies of letter sent by KARL E. MUNDT, member of the committee, to Gov. Thomas E. Bailey, of Mississippi, and approximately 99 others on or about January 20, 1945, relating to a suitable and working criterion to determine what does and what does not comprise un-American propaganda activity, together with the data and material mailed therewith and all replies received thereto, and all further correspondence with the same individuals in connection therewith and such additional correspondence received from other individuals and/or organizations pertaining to the establishment of the working criterion above set forth as to the definition of the terms un-American and/or subversive; all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its members and other memoranda relating to the said letter.

11. Copies of all letters sent by or on behalf of the committee or by any members thereof to the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945, and April 15, 1945, relating to a working criterion for determining what constitutes un-American propaganda activity, or relating to an analysis of letters received purporting to define un-American propaganda; together with all letters received from the Brookings Institution in connection therewith.

12. The report or memorandum submitted to the committee by the Brookings Institution between January 3, 1945 and April 15, 1945, relating to or entitled, "Suggested Standards for Determining Un-American Activities," and all stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee and all its minutes and other memoranda relating to the said report or memorandum.

13. Memorandum of six paragraphs sent to the committee or to Karl E. Mundt, committee member, by the American Civil Lib-

Author	Date	House Report No.	Congress	Session
Wood.....	Mar. 28, 1946.....	1829	79th.....	2d.
Do.....		1836	do.....	Do.
Do.....	May 10, 1946.....	1836	do.....	Do.
Adamson.....	May 29, 1946. Report to Wood. Citations by official Government agencies and private organizations regarding the character of organizations named.			
Wood.....		2233	do.....	Do.
Do.....	June 26, 1946. Corliss Lamont.....	2354	do.....	Do.
Do.....	July 31, 1946. George Marshall.....	2707	do.....	Do.
Do.....	July 31, 1946. Richard Morford.....	2708	do.....	Do.
Do.....		2742	do.....	Do.

erties Union during February 1945, relating to un-American activities, and letter accompanying same.

14. Minutes and transcripts of meetings and executive sessions, not limited to but including, committee action on or about February 21, 1945, relating to a request to the Brookings Institution to analyze the replies to Mundt's letter of January 20, 1945 concerning the working criterion of what comprises an un-American propaganda activity, and to suggest standards for determining un-American propaganda activities.

15. Copy of letter sent by the counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism in which it was stated that the said National Committee to Combat Anti-Semitism "is engaged in solicitation of money for the purpose of controlling the thoughts of American citizens," and all correspondence, minutes and other records in relation thereto, said letter being referred to in CRA, March 1, 1946, at page 1120.

16. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Veterans Against Discrimination in which letter it was noted that the Veterans Against Discrimination had referred to democracy several times and in which it was called to the attention of the Veterans Against Discrimination that the United States is a Republic and not a Democracy, which letter was referred to in CRA (January 29, 1946, at page 740, and all, correspondence, minutes and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.
HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Stenographic transcript of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee of the same from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda" (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution, were considered or acted upon, or on which any action was taken by the committee in connection with the scope of its authority and powers, or in connection with any constitutional limitations thereon.

2. All press releases issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or its chairman or its members from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, dealing with the definition or content of phrases, or any portion of the phrases, "un-American propaganda activities," and/or "subversive and un-American propaganda" (which) attacks the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by our Constitution.

3. All reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to:

Author	Date	House Report No.	Congress	Session
Dies	Jan. 3, 1940	2	76th	1st.
Starnes	Apr. 8, 1940	1476	do	3d.
Dies	Mar. 29, 1940	1937	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940	1900	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940	1936	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 8, 1940	1938	do	Do.
Do	Apr. 2, 1940	1904	do	Do.
Do	Jan. 3, 1941	1	77th	1st.
Starnes (pt. I)	June 25, 1942	2277	do	2d.
Voorhis (pt. II)	July 7, 1942	2277	do	Do.
Do	Sept. 3, 1942	Report of FBI (H. Doc. 833)	do	Do.
Dies	Jan. 2, 1943	2748	do	Do.
Costello	Sept. 30, 1943	717	78th	1st.
Dies	Peace Now	1161	do	2d.
Do	CIO-PAC	1311	do	Do.

Report of a subcommittee of the committee to the full committee publicized on Oct. 30, 1944, relating to a re-investigation of PAC and an investigation of the National Citizens PAC.

4. Transcripts of all hearings, public and executives, held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities, from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including but not limited to the following volumes and subjects:

1938: August 12-23, 1938, September 15-17, volume 1.

September 28-October 6, October 11-13, volume 2.

October 17-22, October 24-November 21, volume 3.

1939: November 19-December 14, volume 4.

December 15, supplement to volume 4.

May 18-June 1, 1939, volume 5.

August 16-29, volume 6.

September 5-27, volumes 7 and 8.

1940: September 28-October 14, volume 9.

October 16-28, volume 10.

October 28-December 3, volume 11.

February 7-April 4, 1940, volume 12.

1941: April 11-May 21, volume 13.

August 29, 1940-August 11, 1941, volume 14.

1943: June 8-July 7, 1943, volume 15.

1944: November 29-December 20, volume 16.

September 27-October 5, 1944, volume 17.

5. All reports of investigators for the committee issued by the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, including a report published in 1938 by investigator for the committee, Edward E. Sullivan, containing a statement, "Evidence tends to show that all phases of radical and Communist activities are rampant among the studios of Hollywood and, although well known, is a matter which movie moguls desire to keep from the public."

6. All releases and statements issued by, or on behalf of, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and/or stenographic transcripts of meetings of the committee from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, relating to or discussing the investigation of organizations, groups, or individuals which disseminate propaganda or influence or attempt to influence public opinion.

7. The records of names of all organizations and groups compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are allegedly "subversive" or un-American.

8. The records of names of all individuals compiled by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which are alleged "subversive" or un-American.

9. For the period from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, all correspondence and memoranda from and to the committee, or from and to individual members of the committee, or from and to members of the committee staff relating to findings by the committee or to material in the committee files concerning the names of organizations, groups, or individuals in the files of the committee.

10. Transcripts of all meetings held by individual committee members and specifically including transcripts of a meeting held by Congressman J. PARNELL THOMAS with officials of the State of New Jersey published by the committee in 1939 or 1940.

11. Copy of letter sent by counsel for the Committee on Un-American Activities to Drew Pearson in which letter a demand was made for an explanation of the phrase "make democracy work," which letter is referred to in C. R. A., February 11, 1946, at page 1257, and all correspondence, minutes, and other records in relation thereto.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.
HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1 and October 30, 1947, at which investigation of Albert Maltz was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise, from January 1 to October 30, 1947, which referred to or discussed Albert Maltz.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Albert Maltz and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January and October 30, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from January 1 to October 30, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Albert Maltz.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Albert Maltz by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES *v.* ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston,
attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between January 1, 1945 and January 1, 1947 at which investigation of Albert Maltz was considered, referred to, or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from January 1, 1945 to January 1, 1947 which referred to or discussed Albert Maltz.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Albert Maltz and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from January 1, 1943 to January 1, 1947 at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Albert Maltz.

5. All reports, communications and correspondence, and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Albert Maltz by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945 to January 1, 1947.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL
COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES V. ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable Chief Justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenney and Charles H. Houston,
attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes and memoranda of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any subcommittee thereof between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945, at which investigation of Albert Maltz was considered, referred to or acted upon or authorized.

2. All releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, which referred to or discussed Albert Maltz.

3. All publications, documents, statements, or communications relating to Albert Maltz, and submitted to the House Committee on Un-American Activities between May 26, 1938, and January 1, 1945.

4. Transcripts of committee meetings or executive sessions from May 26, 1938, to January 1, 1945, at which the committee considered and/or discussed the said Albert Maltz.

5. All reports, communications, and correspondence and memoranda relating to the investigation of the said Albert Maltz by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from May 26, 1938 to January 1, 1945.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL
COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES V. ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said Court on Monday the 3d day of May, 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston,
attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, from October 30, 1947, to date, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from October 30, 1947, to date.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from October 30, 1947, to date.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise from October 30, 1947, to date, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals from October 30, 1947, to date, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period October 30, 1947, to date.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from October 30, 1947, to date, at which the committee considered, and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All the correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 30, 1947, to date.

11. Transcripts of hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities from October 20 through October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry, and all exhibits and applications and motions of counsel for all witnesses who appeared before the said committee at the said hearings.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL
COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES V. ALBERT MALTZ,
NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness, the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston,
attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1 and October 30, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion picture industry from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, whether to the press or otherwise, between January 1 and October 30, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1 and October 30, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators, and particularly its investigators H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1 to October 30, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1 to October 30, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on

Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion-Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1 to October 30, 1947.

11. Transcripts of the hearings held by the House Committee on Un-American Activities or a subcommittee thereof in Los Angeles, Calif., concerning the motion-picture industry on or about May 1947, including specifically the testimony of Louis B. Mayer and all other executives in the motion-picture industry.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, HOLDING A CRIMINAL COURT FOR SAID DISTRICT

THE UNITED STATES V. ALBERT MALTZ, NO. 1354-47, CRIMINAL

The President of the United States to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday the 3d day of May 1948, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify on behalf of the defendant, and bring with you the documentary material described in schedule A, attached hereto and made a part hereof, and not depart the court without leave thereof.

Witness the honorable chief justice of said court, the 28th day of April A. D. 1948.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MARGARET L. BOSWELL,
Deputy Clerk.

Robert W. Kenny and Charles H. Houston, attorneys for Albert Maltz.

Schedule A

1. Minutes of all meetings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, at which investigation of the motion-picture industry was considered, referred to, acted upon, or authorized.

2. Memoranda and reports of investigators for the Committee on Un-American Activities, or any subcommittee thereof, concerning the motion-picture industry from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

3. Transcripts of any testimony taken with relation to the motion-picture industry during the period from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

4. All the releases and statements issued by or on behalf of the House Committee on Un-American Activities whether to the press or otherwise between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, which referred to or discussed the motion-picture industry, and particularly regarding the alleged Communist infiltration in the motion-picture industry.

5. Copies of any letters, reports, or other communications from any person or groups of persons or organizations to the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945 to January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

6. Copies of all letters, correspondence, or other communications from the House Committee on Un-American Activities to any persons, groups, or individuals between January 1, 1945, and January 1, 1947, concerning the motion-picture industry.

7. Copies of all reports made to the House Committee on Un-American Activities by any of its investigators and particularly its investigators, H. A. Smith and A. B. Leckie, concerning the interviews had by the said investigators with the motion-picture producers in Hollywood, Calif., during the period January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

8. Transcripts of committee meetings in executive session held from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947, at which the committee considered and/or acted upon matters relating to the motion-picture industry.

9. All correspondence and communications between representatives of the motion-picture industry and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

10. All correspondence and communications between the Motion Picture Alliance and/or any of its representatives and the House Committee on Un-American Activities from January 1, 1945, to January 1, 1947.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] is recognized for 30 minutes.

NAVAL AVIATION—UNITED STATES AIR SUPREMACY

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, in the summer and fall of 1945, I had an opportunity to travel extensively in western Europe, the Balkans, the Near East, and India. Since this trip I have constantly urged that the United States achieve and maintain air supremacy. In the fall of 1947, as a member of a Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, I again visited western Europe and the countries in the Near East. On this occasion I became more thoroughly convinced than ever that the United States must immediately construct an all-powerful, invincible air armada if the peace of the world is to be maintained.

In an effort to emphasize the compelling necessity of air supremacy, I have made several speeches on this subject in the House. I have introduced appropriation bills providing funds for increasing our air strength and have continually emphasized and reemphasized how essential United States air supremacy is to the survival of our country and to the establishment of an enduring peace.

SEVENTY GROUPS

Great and increasing emphasis has been placed, and rightly so, on the 70-group program of the Air Force. The 70-group program about which there is so much discussion includes, as summarized by General Spaatz, 6,689 aircraft, also 3,212 for the Air National Guard and 2,360 for the Air Reserve. This totals 12,441 planes. In addition, a reserve of 8,100 planes is necessary. This constitutes a grand total of 20,541 planes.

On Thursday, April 15, the House of Representatives, by the overwhelming vote of 343 to 3, appropriated money to begin the construction of the 70-group Air Force. By this action the House rebuffed the administration, which had persistently favored appropriations for only 55 groups. The administration has now proposed 66 groups.

The total appropriation allotted to the Air Force in the House bill passed on April 15 is \$2,295,100,000. Two hundred and fifty million dollars of this is for the liquidation of previously made obligations. Therefore, new funds including cash and authorizations for the placing of plane contracts amount to \$2,045,100,000. Originally the bill called for \$865,000,000 to be used for contracts. The House amended this by adding to it \$822,000,000. Also the time for making such contracts was extended from June 30, 1949, to June 30, 1950. The vote on the amendment was 115 to 0. The decision of the House to begin the construction of a 70-group air force and to in-

crease the strength of the naval air arm is one of the most important steps we have yet taken toward the attainment of a lasting peace.

I hope Congress will disregard the proposal made by the Administration to strike a compromise of 66 groups and emphatically insist that the 70-group plane program for the Air Force be realized at the earliest possible moment. The attitude of compromise is amazing in view of the fact that even with 70 groups of planes the United States will not possess air supremacy but will only have the basis on which to build air supremacy.

NAVAL AVIATION ESSENTIAL TO AIR SUPREMACY

In discussing air power, we have failed to depict the importance of the naval air arm as a necessary prerequisite to the achievement of air supremacy. While the Air Force was laying plans for the minimum peacetime air protection of the United States, which resulted in the proposed 70-group program, the Navy simultaneously developed a program of naval aviation which it deemed essential to carry out its missions. The Navy plan for aviation calls for a force of approximately 14,500 planes. In considering naval aviation the term 14,500-plane Navy is used. This is employed because the various components of the Navy must be expanded if we are to have the necessary support for the 14,500 planes.

Unfortunately the program for naval aviation has not been described as clearly, and the requirements for naval aviation are not as familiar to the country as the requirements for the 70-group air force. It must be borne in mind, however, that the plane program for the Navy is as important to ultimate achievement of air supremacy as the 70-group program. Without an efficient striking naval air arm, we cannot hope to attain complete control of the air. A 14,500-plane Navy has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the same basis as the 70-group program for the Air Force. Just as the 70-group program of 20,541 planes constitutes the number of aircraft to give the irreducible minimum air protection by the Air Force, so the 14,500-plane Navy will give the irreducible minimum air protection by the naval air arm. A total of 35,000 planes is all too small a number for the protection of the United States.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that the number the Naval Air Force asked for, or is it the number of planes that the Secretary of National Defense asked for?

Mr. MERROW. Approximately 14,500 planes is the number the Navy asked for to enable them to carry out their air mission. This program was developed by the Navy at the same time as the Air Force made plans for the 70 groups.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is that all that the Naval Air Force asked for?

Mr. MERROW. That is all, as I understand it, they are calling for at the moment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted that the gentleman has

brought up this point, because it has not been stressed enough. As the gentleman knows, when unification went through, the Navy for a long time was not allowed to present its case.

Mr. MERROW. I do not think that the case for the Naval Air Force has been properly presented, and that is why I am speaking about it today.

The Air Force is asking for 12,441 planes with a reserve of 8,100, making a total of about 20,541 planes. The Navy is asking for approximately 14,500 planes. This should be carefully considered. The 14,500-plane Navy is as important in achieving air supremacy as the 70-group program.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman is making a great contribution as always. He never fails to make an extensive study of any subject about which he talks. Is it not important to have the Naval air forces and carriers so that they can strike at distant points without returning to their bases in the United States for refueling?

Mr. MERROW. This is indeed most essential in achieving control of the air. I thank the gentleman for her kind and constructive words.

NAVAL PROGRAM ACCELERATED

Originally the Navy planned to realize its program of a 14,500-plane Navy over a period of 6 years. It was estimated that in 1954 the cost of such a Navy including aviation would level off to approximately \$8,000,000,000 a year. The appropriations until then were to be on a sliding scale.

Since the submission of the original naval budget for 1949, the world picture has become much worse. In view of the increasing international tension, the Navy has decided to bring into actual readiness for operation the 14,500-plane Navy as soon as possible rather than wait for a period of years for this achievement. It has been decided that beginning in July 1948, the Navy will build up to a 14,500-plane inventory to be completed by July 1, 1949. In order to do so it is necessary to take out of storage 3,000 obsolescent aircraft. The Navy has the original structure and most of the personnel to implement a 14,500-plane Navy next year. It is imperative, however, to replace obsolescent aircraft with modern planes. Since this change in planning has become essential because of Soviet aggression, increased international tension, the general deterioration of world relations, and the necessity of national security, Congress, if it views realistically the disturbing international picture, must increase immediately the appropriations for the Navy. More money must be provided than was authorized in the bill which the House passed on April 15.

MONEY VOTED FOR THE NAVY

In the bill acted upon by the House on April 15, the money allotted to the Navy amounted to \$903,000,000. One hundred fifty million dollars of this is assigned for liquidation of obligations already consummated. Seven hundred fifty-three million dollars in new funds were provided for contractual authorizations for planes and equipment. In

other words, \$753,000,000 is for the procurement or the buying of new planes. This amount of money is insufficient and much more should be made immediately available for procurement if the Navy is to realize a modern up-to-date 14,500-plane program. True, an inventory of 14,500 planes can be realized but a large number will be obsolete.

NEW AIRCRAFT REQUIREMENTS

The financial requirements for new aircraft have greatly increased as a result of more complete and detailed cost break-downs. The original estimates for the development of a 14,500-plane Navy were far too low. More realistic schedules have been prepared for the annual deliveries necessary if the Navy is to achieve its program.

For the fiscal year 1949, 1,200 planes are to be delivered. This money for all but 60 of these planes, was authorized in the 1948 budget. In the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1949, provision was made for 1,050 planes to be delivered in 1950. The 1949 appropriation estimates as approved by the House of Representatives on the 15th of April contain \$753,000,000 for the procurement of 1,535 new aircraft in 1949 with deliveries in 1950. Even this is insufficient.

Authorizations for procurement and delivery of planes should be increased, as follows:

Authorization:	
1949-----	3,002
1950-----	3,810
1951-----	3,597
1952-----	3,028
Delivery:	
1949-----	0
1950-----	3,002
1951-----	3,810
1952-----	3,597
1953-----	3,028

It is obvious that the average procurement should be a little above 3,300 planes a year if we are to replace the naval aircraft which become obsolete in 5 years. The naval planes should be replaced every 5 years, and it follows that in order to do this we must manufacture and deliver over 3,300 naval planes annually.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROCUREMENT

In order to bring into existence the procurement program that I have outlined, much more money must be allotted for this purpose. Funds for the procurement or the purchase of required planes during the four fiscal years to which I have referred in the above tables is estimated as follows:

1949-----	\$1,351,074,000
1950-----	1,691,831,000
1951-----	1,965,387,000
1952-----	1,601,857,000

If the 14,500-plane Navy is to be achieved and implemented, it will be necessary to increase the 1949 budget procurement figures to the amount I have given for 1949, which is \$1,351,074,000. This is an increase of \$598,074,000 above the \$753,000,000 recently approved by the House. In other words, the House should have voted approximately an additional \$600,000,000 for naval procurement alone if we are to have a 14,500-plane Navy. By doing this, the aircraft procurement would be increased by 1,467 or a total of 3,002.

NAVAL EXPANSION

It must be emphasized that the figures I have given are only for naval aircraft procurement. In addition, the entire Navy must be built up commensurate with the Air Force and naval aviation. We cannot expect to bring our full air power to bear on an overseas enemy by operating only from bases on the Western Hemisphere.

If full striking power is to be developed, many combatant elements of the Air Force plus supporting marine and Army forces must be transported to overseas bases. The accomplishment of this broad task requires strong Navy, marine, and amphibious components. Therefore, expansion of air power without a commensurate expansion of the necessary Navy surface and subsurface units would not permit the Navy to conduct its assigned missions.

It is impossible to consider the naval air arm apart from the Navy itself. To bring a 14,500-plane Navy into being will require an increase in appropriations for the entire Navy extending over a period of years. The whole Navy must be expanded if we are to have the support necessary for the 14,500 planes. I want to make it perfectly clear that the increase in procurement funds must be followed by an increase in funds for other components of the Navy.

Naval aviation looking to the accomplishment of its future missions as a vital part of air power as well as sea power has drafted a program of expansion. This program is designed to assure only the minimum requirements for the security of the United States. It involves reserves as well as active squadrons.

During this period of expansion, the program calls for increasing the total operating aircraft of the Navy from 7,850 to 10,700 planes or an increase of 36 percent. Of this total 2,700 will be naval and Marine Corps Reserve as against 2,050 currently available.

Ready combatant units account directly for 2,100 of the total increase of 2,850 operating planes. Combatant ready carrier air groups, marine amphibious support, and seaplane squadrons will be jumped from 2,300 to 4,400. Of these, 1,100 will be manned by reserves.

There are two reasons for the increase in combatant units: First, expansion of the immediately available forces to meet minimum emergency needs; and second, to provide replacement units not now available to permit naval aviation to engage in continuous actions despite losses and fatigue.

Of the 10,700 operating planes, about 56 percent will be of carrier, fighter, and attack types; 8 percent, long-range type; 25 percent, training; and 11 percent, utility transport and helicopter types. In addition to the operating planes, 3,800 in overhaul or repair status and logistic pools and pipe lines will make the total inventory of 14,500 modern aircraft.

The Navy's plan is a tenfold program. It provides for the needs of four separate fleet combat forces, each with its own unique functional mission. It provides also for six major categories of supporting activities whose growth must parallel

that of the combat forces. In view of this, it is easy to understand why the whole Navy must be considered in the true picture of naval aviation. This gives us the reason for calling it a 14,500-plane Navy. All the elements must be built up, and therefore it is necessary not only to vote the funds for procurement of planes but to vote the funds necessary to expand the entire Navy. Following is a brief outline of the various elements in the 14,500-plane Navy:

COMBAT FORCES

First. Attack carrier forces: Expansion is planned for the present force of 11 medium and large carriers, with only 13 operating air groups and 1,430 planes in both oceans, to a force of 16 attack carriers with 32 air groups and 2,500 fighter and attack planes ready for combat.

These carriers will be the primary weapon of naval air power against an enemy air force and its supporting bases and industries. By 1952, faster, longer-ranged fighters and attack planes able to carry all types of weapons will form a substantial part of this force. One new large carrier is planned for completion as a part of this program. The other four additional operating carriers required will come from the laid-up fleet.

The provision of two air groups per carrier is necessary to keep four task groups, with more than 1,000 planes, continuously in action. The present lack of spare groups allows no replacement for losses or fatigue. Eight of the 32 planned air groups will be manned by combat-ready Reserves.

Second. Marine amphibious support aviation: Fleet Marine force squadrons are scheduled to increase from 23, with 490 planes to 40, with 850 planes. These squadrons operate from escort carriers or advance bases, as required, to support acquisition of beachheads and air bases abroad. Six escort carriers will be operated regularly in peacetime. Others can be obtained quickly from the inactive fleet in an emergency. One-fifth of these marine planes will be manned by combat-ready Reserves.

Third. Submarine killer carriers: Expansion is urgently required from the present grossly inadequate force of 3 escort carriers, 3 air groups, and less than 100 planes, to 8 light and escort carriers, 24 air groups, and 530 planes. These figures emphasize how necessary it is to expand the entire Navy. These units will operate with surface-killer vessels to hunt down and destroy submarines. In view of the rapidity with which Russia is constructing a submarine fleet, we must reactivate more submarine-killer carriers with the requisite number of planes if we are to possess adequate protection. The 5 additional operating carriers operating in peacetime are available from the moth-ball fleet. One-third of the air groups will be in the combat-ready Reserve.

Fourth. Land-based sea-patrol aircraft: The program calls for expansion from 34 seaplane and landplane patrol squadrons, with 300 planes, to 52 squadrons, including 12 from the combat-ready Reserve, with 520 planes. In addition, 16 blimps must be maintained in

fleet-patrol squadrons. These forces will cooperate with surface vessels in sea patrol and convoy escort in all oceans and in hunting submarines. These peacetime bases extend from Guam to Hawaii, Alaska to Panama, Newfoundland to Florida, Bermuda to Trinidad.

SUPPORT ELEMENTS

First. Pilot training: We need to increase the number of Navy and Marine aviators. Training of new pilots is barely sufficient to maintain the regular services at their present strength. It provides no excess to replace pilots leaving the Reserve or to expand the totals on duty. We must increase pilot training, and this will require 2,000 aircraft in the Naval Air Training Command, compared to the present 1,050. A high rate of utilization of aircraft under an expanded program, plus changes in training methods, will permit training output to be increased more than the number of airplanes to be required.

Second. Reserve training: Because a substantial part of the present Reserve squadron organization will be converted to a combat-ready status, comparable with Regular Navy and Marine Corps combatant units, a decrease from 2,050 to 1,600 is planned in aircraft assigned to remaining Reserve training units.

Third. Research and development: Naval aviation will maintain and expand research, developmental, experimental, test, electronics and other equipment, and guided missiles. To these activities 550 aircraft will be continued to be assigned.

Fourth. Fleet support: An increase from 1,150 to 1,380 in aircraft operated by the combat training, utility, air transport, rescue and service activities of Fleet and Fleet Marine Force aviation, is required to maintain the expanded combat forces in a state of full combat readiness.

Fifth. Bases and logistic support: Expansion will be required in the base facilities needed to support the increased volume of fleet combat, training and service activities, to supply these activities, and to maintain, overhaul and modify their aircraft and equipment.

The present 55 domestic and 24 extra-continental air stations in operation are scheduled for increase to 74 and 25 respectively.

Sixth. Production of airplanes and equipment: To support the program for expansion after full strength is attained, an annual production of 3,300 airplanes, with a total air-frame weight of about 25,000,000 pounds will be required. Of this, 76 percent of the planes will be of combat types.

SUPPORTING TABLES FOR THE BREAK-DOWN OF THE 14,500-PLANE NAVY

The figures which follow are divisions into operating units and by types of the Navy's plan of the 14,500 planes required to make it possible for the Navy to carry out its assigned mission.

The requirement of 14,500 aircraft has been approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the Navy on the same basis as the 70-group plan of the Air Force. The Navy now has operating 5,793 planes and an inventory of about 11,000.

Break-down by operating units and by types

Total USN operating.....	8,015
Total USNR operating.....	2,672

Grand total operating.....	10,687
Logistic support.....	3,787

Total planes HTA.....	14,474
Total lighter-than-air.....	32

Break-down by operating units

NAVY		
USN:	Groups	Aircraft
Attack carrier air groups.....	24	1,860
ASW carrier air groups.....	16	352
Total.....	40	2,212

USNR:		
Attack carrier air groups.....	8	632
ASW carrier air groups.....	8	176
Total.....	16	808

Total carrier air groups.....	56	3,020
-------------------------------	----	-------

Patrol squadrons, USN.....	40	400
Patrol squadrons, USNR.....	12	120

Total patrol squadrons.....	52	520
-----------------------------	----	-----

Marine Corps:		
Carrier groups (amphibious) USMC.....	6	144
Air groups (support) USMC.....	27	540
Total.....	33	684
Air groups (support) USMCR.....	7	168
Total Marine Corps.....	40	852

Break-down by types

COMBAT	
Fighters.....	5,990
Attack.....	1,972
Patrol (heavy land).....	292
Patrol (medium land).....	306
Patrol (medium sea).....	193
Patrol (amphibian).....	65
Total combat.....	6,818

NONCOMBAT	
Transport, heavy land.....	171
Transport, medium land.....	321
Utility, multi-engined.....	492
Utility, single-engined.....	119
Training, multi-engined.....	694
Training, single-engined.....	1,883
Helicopters, observation.....	189

Total noncombat.....	3,869
----------------------	-------

Total operating aircraft, heavier than-air.....	10,687
Logistic support (in transit, overhaul, etc.).....	3,787

Total heavier-than-air craft.....	14,474
Total lighter-than-air craft.....	32

FOURTEEN THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED PROGRAM DOES NOT INCLUDE A RESERVE POOL

It is considered that a reserve pool of aircraft is of little value unless trained flight and maintenance groups are available on very short notice to operate these aircraft. It is reasonable to expect that a high attrition of aircraft in the early stages of war will be accompanied by a high attrition in flight groups. Time will not be available to train additional necessary groups or to manufacture required additional aircraft. The Navy considers that the personnel and aircraft of the ready Naval Reserve will provide best these necessary replacements in the

early stages of a war and at the same time permit as much economy as possible in peacetime. It is felt by the Navy that the funds necessary to modernize an aircraft pool would be better spent in keeping a smaller number actually operating.

CONTROL OF THE AIR

I wish to state as forcibly as I know how that if we are to achieve United States air supremacy, we must have an air force equal to any air force or combination of air forces in the world. If we are to develop air power so that our voice can be heard and our will respected in the sections of the planet where there are American interests, then it is necessary to bring into being immediately the 70-group air force program and the 14,500-plane Navy.

Since in the event of another conflict, the first attack will come from the air, it necessarily follows that the defense must originate from the air. In all probability Navy planes will strike first because they are on carriers which are mobile and can be brought within close proximity to any shore. When we have appropriated sufficient funds to provide 20,451 planes for the Air Force and to create a 14,500-plane Navy, we will have a striking force of approximately 35,000 planes. This is only the minimum air protection for the United States. It is not air supremacy. Should we be attacked, vast and immediate expansion would be necessary. With the 70-group program and the 14,500 plane Navy, we would have the basis on which to build air supremacy. We would have the starting point for winning the next war.

It is unfortunate that the administration does not exercise the foresight and the vision to comprehend the fact that overwhelming air power is our first line of defense. Major emphasis should be placed not on the Army, not on the Navy as such, but on achievement and maintenance of air supremacy through the Air Force and naval aviation. It is also unfortunate that the administration does not act without fear or favor according to the true spirit of unification and save billions of dollars by effecting a thoroughgoing unification of the armed services. Too often, thinking about national defense is in terms of the past and not in terms of what the exigencies of the future may present. It is regrettable that the administration opposes the immediate achievement of overwhelming air power. It is also regrettable that the Congress does not with complete dispatch and unanimity vote all the funds necessary for laying the secure foundation for the achievement of complete United States air supremacy.

I must repeat again what I have so often stated, that all the funds required to keep us the strongest military Nation on this planet should be unhesitatingly appropriated by the Congress; and then having done this, the Congress should insist that the armed services efficiently and effectively move to an early and full realization of this proposed goal. Congress has an opportunity for leadership. We have the power to appropriate the funds. It is within our province to give directions to the Department of National Defense and to insist that this Department reach air supremacy. Were we to

do this and were we to insist upon complete unification, the bickering, the uncertainty, and indecision would terminate. Congress controls the appropriations and Congress can lay down any principle it wishes. If we insist on air supremacy, the Department of National Defense must deliver.

I have no objection to talking about a balanced program. I hope we can achieve it someday. It would be an excellent thing if we were living in a balanced world, but such is not the case. We must be realistic. First things must be placed first. Air power, overwhelming and invincible, must be created at all costs. A strong and all-powerful United States is the surest guaranty for the perpetuation of a society of free nations. By adopting and acting upon the principle of sufficient preparedness, by the appropriation of funds to carry out this purpose, and by insisting that the armed services achieve complete air supremacy we will be able to win the long-protracted struggle in which we are engaged for the achievement of an enduring peace.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 51. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of the hearings on investigation of national resources for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; approved July 16, 1947.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 30, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1506. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Chairman, the Textile Foundation, transmitting the Annual Report of the Textile Foundation, for the fiscal year ending December 31, 1947, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3194. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1833). Referred to the Committee

of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6113. A bill to transfer certain land in Langlade County, Wis., to the United States Forest Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 1834). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6301. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1835). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2287. An act to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1836). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 6386. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of roads and other public facilities in the States of North Dakota and Minnesota which were destroyed or damaged by recent floods; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 6387. A bill to authorize Federal cooperation in the acquisition and preservation by the State of California of the south Calaveras grove of big trees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6388. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 6389. A bill to authorize Federal cooperation in the acquisition and preservation by the State of California of the south Calaveras grove of big trees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 6390. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior an Office of National Minerals Resources, Production, and Conservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6391. A bill to amend section 3224 (2) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 6392. A bill to permit the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to sell a certain war-housing project to the Housing Authority of the city of Las Vegas, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 6393. A bill to authorize the acquisition of an ice cutter to relieve ice-bound traffic on Lake Erie; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 6394. A bill to amend section 731 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 6395. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6396. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 6397. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to provide a civil government for the trust territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. Res. 563. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Indians of the United States and Alaska; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 564. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 563, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. Res. 565. Resolution authorizing funds for study of plans for rehabilitation of Capitol Power Plant; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOOTE:

H. R. 6398. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 6399. A bill for the relief of Frank O. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1851. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the National Guard and Naval Militia Association of the State of New York, urging the Congress to adopt a Selective Service Act that provides an exemption from draft of any member in good standing of the National Guard and Organized Naval Reserve in the several States until the adoption of a Universal Military Training Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1852. By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Petition of Wirt H. Ferguson, in regard to the United Nations organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1853. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the members of the Southern Wholesale Hardware Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts' explanation of the proposal for a federal union of the civil-liberty democracies as set forth in Clarence K. Streit's book *Union Now* and his booklet *Federal Union of the Free*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 30, 1948

(Legislative day of Thursday, April 22, 1948)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of grace and God of glory, when we resent having so many choices to make, may we remember that good character is the habit of choosing right from wrong.

Help us as a nation to see that our strongest defense lies back in home and school and church where is built the character that gives free people the power to win their freedom and to hold

it. May we never forget that it is only under God that this Nation or any nation can be free.

And when we have learned well this lesson, then shall we have for export more than money, even the faith and idealism for which all who love liberty will be willing to live. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 28, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 28, 1948,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore signed on April 29, 1948, the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 29, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On April 28, 1948:

S. 1021. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salaries and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and clerk of the Fort Peck General Council, members of the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and other committees appointed by said Fort Peck General Council, and official delegates of the Fort Peck Tribes;

S. 2278. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in San Juan County, Utah, to the Southwest Indian Mission, Inc.; and

S. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution to establish the Fort Sumter National Monument in the State of South Carolina.

On April 29, 1948:

S. 1481. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District;

S. 1696. An act to amend the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784), so as to extend the jurisdiction of the United States District Court, Territory of Hawaii, over Canton and Enderbury Islands; and

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

On April 30, 1948:

S. 1468. An act providing for payment of \$50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. ANDREWS of New York and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas had been appointed additional managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1641) to establish the Women's Army Corps in the Regular Army, to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6055) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 34 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6355. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2409. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1947;

H. R. 1036. An act to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators as ship radio officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to provide salvage facilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5448. An act to amend sections 212 (b) and 231 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask permission of the Senate that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated: